Central BAPTIST
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

KANSAS CITY, KANSAS

THE ORIGINS OF THE FESTIVAL OF HANUKKAH

(THE SO-CALLED FEAST OF THE DEDICATION)

THE ORIGINS OF THE FESTIVAL OF HANUKKAH

THE JEWISH NEW-AGE FESTIVAL

By

REV. OLIVER SHAW RANKIN
B.D., D.LITT.
MINISTER OF THE PARISH OF SORBIE, WIGTOWNSHIRE

EDINBURGH: T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET
1930

LIBRARY
CENTRAL BAPTIST SEMINARY
KANSAS CITY 2, KANSAS

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
MORRISON AND GIBB LIMITED

FOR

T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH

LONDON: SIMPKIN MARSHALL, LIMITED
NEW YORK: CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

296.435
R211

PREFACE

With the encouragement of the late Professor Dr. Hugo Gressmann, my much revered and esteemed teacher at the University of Berlin, this study of the origins of the festival of Hanukkah was begun. The subject of Hanukkah has seemed (see Gressmann, *Die Aufgaben der Wissenschaft des nachbiblischen Judentums*, 1925, p. 20) to demand further investigation than that made by Ewald, Wellhausen, Krauss, Hochfeld, and others, while also the views of these three last-named exponents of Hanukkah have not hitherto met with a thorough criticism, comparison, and analysis.

It is evident that this festival, which, except in the First and Second Books of Maccabees, receives from the time of its appearance (164 B.C.) till the rise of Rabbinic legend but scant and brief mention in Jewish writings, is of very great religious and historical importance. It is the most notable religious deposit of Judaism of the Hellenistic period in that sphere where religion finds its most general and popular expression, namely, the realm of festival practice and rites. In this realm the historian must recognize that here are spread before him those durable marks and visible features of the civilization of the race which he studies. Provided the clue to their meaning in the days of their origin, and to the reason of their being further shapen or modified in the course of time, can be read, festival rites are the record, supplementary to the literary evidence, of a people's religious thought. A study of the Passover, for example, such as Dr. Buchanan Gray has made (*Sacrifice in the Old Testament*, p. 352 f.), is an unfolding of Hebrew religious history from the early stage of primitive blood-ritual belief, through the age of the Reformation effected by Josiah, down to the Græco-Roman period, traces of the influence of which upon Judaism this festival bears.

Hanukkah can be regarded as the memorial of the Maccabean wars of freedom. In the following chapters the festival appears, in the circumstances of its origin and in the transformation of the rites it inherited from its pagan predecessor, as focus of the religious history and theological thought of Judaism in the period of the Hellenic domination, an experience which in the national life is only surpassed by the Exile. Hanukkah is represented as a Jewish conversion of Hellenistic rites, as interpretation, in accord with the national genius, of the cult of Kronos-Helios (Bel-samin), and in particular of Dionysian and Apolline ritual attaching to that cult. Further, the soul of the festival, its ideal *motif*, as of the celebrations it supplanted, is discovered in conceptions of the New Age.

The date of Hanukkah, 25th Kislev to 2nd Tebeth, has been regarded not only by scholars who believe that the festival renders innocuous a heathen Winter-solstice celebration, but also by those who doubt or contest this hypothesis, as beginning on, or covering the 25th of December. Against this assumption Professor Martin P. Nilsson has recently entered a very decided *caveat*. The question to which day in the solar calendar the 25th of Kislev corresponds is therefore fundamental, and I have endeavoured to answer it by evidence of Jewish and Syrian calendral data.

In view of the apparent similarity of features of Hanukkah and of the festival of Booths, a resemblance which has been responsible for robbing Hanukkah of its individuality and originality, for obscuring its nature and importance, for reducing it to the rank of a second Booths, it has been necessary to direct special attention to the peculiar ritual of Hanukkah, and to lay emphasis upon the priority of rite over later festival-exposition, festival-legend, and myth. In discussion of the significance which was given to the ritual of setting the Hanukkah-lamp at the door of the dwelling-house, outside, the generally rejected theory of Grätz that the light was symbol of the Law has seemed to admit of being placed upon a more substantial foundation than that of metaphor. The development of Grätz's theory, here undertaken, may appear also to have achieved the purpose of casting into relief the religious beliefs and spirit of the time in which the festival assumed Jewish guise. The completer significance of the lamp has, however, been sought in the ideas of sovereignty (of Jahveh and the ruling house) which had their setting in the principal conception of Hanukkah as Aion-festival, or festival of the New Age.

I take the opportunity of expressing deep indebtedness to the Rev. Dr. W. W. D. Gardiner, the Rev. W. Arnold Reid, of Whithorn, and R. E. Wallace-James, Esq., of Edinburgh, for securing for me access to various libraries; to the late Rev. Dr. H. J. Wotherspoon for his unfailing kindness and interest in my work; and to my sister, Mary Theresa Rankin, D.Phil., Lecturer in Political Economy in the University of Edinburgh, for her aid in manifold ways. I have gratefully to acknowledge assistance from the Carnegie Research Scheme towards the expense of the publication of this book.

My chief thanks are due to my wife, who prepared the MS. of this work, to whom, as that "light of the house" which, according to Maimonides (cap. iv. 14, *Hilkoth Megillah wa-Hanukkah*), has even precedence of the lighting of the Hanukkah-lamp, I affectionately dedicate his words : נר ביתו קודם משום שלום ביתו.

O. S. RANKIN.

MANSE OF SORBIE,
WIGTOWNSHIRE,
18*th November* 1930.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

THE SOURCES

PAGES

Classification of the Sources of Information concerning Hanukkah 3–5

The Date of 1 Maccabees 5–7

The Era used in 1 and 2 Maccabees 7–9

The Date of Hanukkah, 164 b.c. 9

2 Maccabees i.–ii. 18 and xi. not the Work of Jason but of the Epitomist 10–16

The Date of 2 Maccabees 16–18

The Sources of 1 and 2 Maccabees . . . 18–19

The Principle applying to the Use of 1 and 2 Maccabees 20

Their Historical Value 21–24

CHAPTER II

HANUKKAH, THE FESTIVAL OF INSTITUTION, REPLENISHING, AND RENEWAL

The Significance of חנך, חנכה in O.T. . . . 27–38

The Meaning of ἐνκαινίζειν in Epistle to Hebrews 38–41

ἐνκαινίζειν in Secular Use, 2 Maccabees ii. 19, Pap. Paris, 16. 24; in Ecclesiastical Use in Early Church 41–44

ἐνκαινισμός in 1 and 2 Maccabees—The Hanukkah of the House—The Wider Aspects of Hanukkah . 45–55

CHAPTER III

INTERPRETATIONS OF THE LIGHTS OF HANUKKAH

(1) 1 Maccabees and the Light-Symbol of Hanukkah 59–60

(2) 2 Maccabees interprets the Light-Symbol by Reference to the Sacred Fire, "Fire from Heaven" 61–63

PAGES
THE CONCEPT OF SACRED FIRE AMONG VARIOUS PEOPLES 63–65
THE PREPARATORY STAGE OF THE BELIEF IN JUDAISM 65–67
THE INFLUENCE OF IRANIAN THOUGHT ON JEWISH CONCEPT OF . . . .
(*a*) THE SACRED FIRE FOR THE ALTAR . . 67–73
(*b*) FIRE AS AGENT IN WORLD JUDGMENT . 73–74
(*c*) AND POSSIBLY ON THE CUSTOM OF THE SABBATH-LAMP 74–76
2 MACCABEES RE-INTERPRETS THE LIGHT-SYMBOL OF HANUKKAH 76
(3) INTERPRETATION OF THE LAMPS BY JOSEPHUS . 76–77
(4) INTERPRETATION OF THE LAMPS BY SAB. 21, B.—OPPOSITION TO THE INTERPRETATION OF 2 MACCABEES—MOTIVES OF THE INTERPRETATION BY SAB. 21, B. . . 77–79
(5) INTERPRETATION BY PESIKTA RABBATHI AND MEGILLATH TAʿANITH IX. (SCHOLION)—MOTIVE OF THIS INTERPRETATION 79–80
(6) THEORY OF KRAUSS—LAMPS AN INSTITUTION OF THE SCRIBES IN TIME OF HEROD—FESTIVAL OF HEROD—PERSIUS, SAT. V. 179 f.—CRITICISM OF THE THEORY OF KRAUSS 80–86
(7) HOCHFELD STRENGTHENS THE THEORY OF KRAUSS, OF STAGES OF DEVELOPMENT IN HANUKKAH AFTER THE DAYS OF JUDAS—WEAKNESS OF HOCHFELD'S CONCLUSIONS 86–87
(8) ORIENTATION OF RESEARCH TO THE SOURCES OF 1 AND 2 MACCABEES AND TO PRE-MACCABEAN PERIOD . 87–88

CHAPTER IV

THE FESTIVAL OF BOOTHS OF THE MONTH OF KISLEV

(1) COMPARISON OF THE FESTIVALS, HANUKKAH AND BOOTHS 91
(2) DIFFERENCES AND RESEMBLANCES — HANUKKAH NOT MODELLED ON BOOTHS 91–102
(3) 2 MACCABEES' INTERPRETATION OF HANUKKAH AS "BOOTHS" OF KISLEV FOLLOWS THE TRADITIONAL METHOD OF INTERPRETING FESTIVALS 102–104
(4) WELLHAUSEN'S HYPOTHESIS OF THE ORIGIN OF HANUKKAH —A DIONYSIAN FESTIVAL OF THE WINTER-SOLSTICE 104–106

PAGES

(5) 2 Maccabees x. 6–7 and a Dionysian Origin of Hanukkah as "Booths of Kislev" 106–114

(6) The Title of the Festival—Dionysian Rites transformed by Hanukkah in its Aspect of "Booths of Kislev" 114–116

(7) The Rite of the Hanukkah-Lamp is not explained by Dionysian Illuminations or by Winter-Solstice Fires and Lights 116–119

(8) The Assumption that 25th Kislev is the Winter-Solstice Inadmissible 119

(9) Nilsson's Criticism of the Winter-Solstice Theory as represented by Wellhausen, Meyer, Norden, and Kittel 119–123

(10) Traces of Dionysian Elements in the Religion of Hellenized Jews in the Same Century—Mysia and Rome 123–129

CHAPTER V

THE ORIGIN OF HANUKKAH AS FESTIVAL OF LIGHTS

(1) The Ritual of the Hanukkah-Lamp—A Lamp placed at the Door of the House, Outside . . 133–136

(2) The Policy of Antiochus Epiphanes with regard to the Jewish Sacrificial System—Altars (1 Maccabees i. 55) placed Outside the Houses—Burnings "at the Doors of the Houses and in the Streets" 136–139

(3) The Altars at the Door are associated with the Cult of Apollo, Thuraios-Agyieus . . . 140–141

(4) The Two Marks of the Acceptance of Hellenization; the Statements of Hippolytus and Valerius Maximus 141–143

(5) The Lamp at the Door as supplanting the Burnings on the Altars—The Festival-Legend of "the Fire" (2 Maccabees i. 18 f.) and the Apollo-Myth—The Concept of Apollo in Judaism . . . 143–146

(6) The Question of the Connexion of the Burnings on the Street-Altars with the Festival of 25th of Kislev 147–148

(7) The Custom of the Lamp evolved from the Custom of Burnings—A Probable Analogy . . 148–151

CHAPTER VI

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE LAMP—THE THEORY OF GRÄTZ

I

PAGES

(1) When the Ritual was transformed, the Interpretation of the New Ritual had to be of a Reflective Character—The Theory of Grätz—The Lamp a Sign of the Law 155–157

(2) The Cult of Apollo had been Essentially Oracular—"Empura Semata" 157–158

(3) 1 Maccabees iii. 48, Consultation of the Law as the Heathen consulted their Deities for Oracles 158–159

Semavatha (Meg. Taʿan. ix.)—Ps. lxxiv.—Heathen Signs but no Jewish Prophets 159–162

The Conceptions in Judaism regarding the Function of a Prophet 162–164

"The Law and the Prophets"—Prophets become the Guardians of the Law 164–166

II

Grätz Theory viewed in Light of— . . . .

(a) The Tendency to make Festivals commemorative of the Law or Covenant . . . 166–168

(b) The Literature which describes the Revolt as in behalf of the Law (1 and 2 Maccabees, Jubilees, the Damascus-Text) . . 168–170

(c) Signs or Symbols of the Law, Mezuzah, Phylacteries (Sab. 22, a—The Placing of the Lamp opposite the Mezuzah) . . . 171–174

III

The Symbol of Light—The Entrance into Judaism of a Theology of Light, attaching to Jewish Eschatology and to the Law—Wisdom—The Daēna—Light-Virgin—Law—Prov.; Sirach; Sap. Sol.; Ps. cxix.; Ps. xix.; Sirach and Test. XII.—Test. Lev. xiv.—Gnosis and φῶς 174–188

CHAPTER VII

THE FESTIVAL OF THE NEW AGE

I

PAGES

The Kikellia, regarded by Norden and Kittel as Type of Winter-Solstice Festival underlying Hanukkah 191–193

Nilsson's Criticism of the View that the Kikellia was a Solstice Celebration 193–196

The Hebrew Tradition regarding the Seasons—Midwinter in Tebeth 196–197

25th Kislev was Ten Days after the Beginning of Winter (Baba Mezia, 106b) 198–199

μέσος Χειμών (Middle of Winter) = 6th January (Fr. Boll)—The 8th of November is the "Beginning of Winter"—18th November, New Year's Day in Syria (Festival of the Sun-God) . . . 199–203

II

The Sun-God in Syria is Kronos-Helios . . 204–207

The Identification of Zarvan (Bel) with Kronos-Helios in Hellenistic Age in Syria—This Union (Chaldean-Iranian Astral Religion) promotes the Spread of Aion-Mysticism or Speculation concerning the World Ages 207–209

Aion-Worship in Egypt—Festival in Alexandria on 5th–6th January—Isis "the Nature of the Aion"—In First Century b.c. Aion identified by Romans with Janus—Aion-Concept in Vergil's "Ecl."—In Jewish Writings—The Two Aions (Dan.)—The New Age—The Supreme God, to whom the Pre-Hanukkah Festival referred, was Kronos-Helios . 209–216

III

The Historical Setting of Hanukkah—The Festival of a New Epoch—The Maccabean Princes a "Messianic" Race—Judas' Aims—Malkuth Jahveh . . 216–220

The "Lamp of Israel" an Expression of Messianic Character and Symbol of Sovereignty . . 220–223

IV

PAGES
JOSEPHUS' EXPLANATION OF THE "LIGHTS" . . 223–225
THE HANUKKAH SCRIPTURE-LESSONS—THE HAPHTARAH-READING (ZECH. II. 14 f.)—THE DWELLING OF JAHVEH AMONG MEN IN THE NEW AION 225–227
THE HOMILIES OF THE PESIKTA OF RAB KAHANA, ON HANUKKAH—THE THEME OF THE NEW AGE . . . 228–230

CHAPTER VIII

THE FESTIVAL OF THE NEW AGE (*continued*)

I

THE DIONYSIAN AND APOLLINE RITES IN A KRONOS-HELIOS FESTIVAL—DIONYSUS AND APOLLO . . . 233–236
APOLLO AND HELIOS—THE EARTHLY BEARERS OF GOVERNMENT IN THE NEW AGE HAVE A HEAVENLY (SOLAR) PROTOTYPE 236
CLAUDANIUS—VERGIL—DANIEL 236–240
THE NEW-AGE CONCEPT AND THE IDEA OF DIVINE-KING 240–242
AION—JANUS—APOLLO; THE CULT OF APOLLO IN ROME 242–243

II

HANOK AND HANUKKAH—CRITICISM OF KITTEL'S THEORY THAT HANOK (ENOCH) REPRESENTS A YEAR-GOD, AND THAT THE TITLE HANUKKAH REVEALS THE SOLAR CHARACTER OF THE FESTIVAL 243–250

III

THE TWO SIGNIFICANCES OF THE LIGHT-SYMBOL OF HANUKKAH, LAW AND SOVEREIGNTY, COMBINE IN THE AION-CONCEPT 250–256

APPENDIXES

I. THE MISHNAH REFERENCES TO HANUKKAH . 259–260
II. CLAUDIANUS, "DE CONSULATU STILICHONIS" . 261–263
III. HANUKKAH AND THE SAMARITANS . . . 264–272
IV. THE REFERENCE TO THE FESTIVAL IN ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL 273–278

LITERATURE

Abelson, J.	*Jewish Mysticism*, London, 1913.
Albrecht, Dr. Karl	*Mischnah-Traktat Bikkurim* (herausgegeb. von Beer u. Holtzmann).
Baumgarten, W.	*Das Buch Daniel*, Giessen, 1926.
Beer	*Mischnah-Traktat Sabbath.*
Bertholet, D. A.	*Das religionsgesch. Problem des Spätjudentums*, Tübingen, 1909.
,, ,,	*Die israelitischen Vorstellungen vom Zustand nach dem Tode*, Tübingen, 1914.
,, ,,	*Biblische Theologie d. A. Test.*, 1911.
Bevan	"A Note on Antiochus Epiphanes" (*Journal of Hellenic Studies*, vol. xx. 1900).
Boll, F.	"Kronos-Helios," art. in *Arch. für Religions-Wissensch.* (herausgegeb. v. O. Weinreich), xix. 1916–1919.
Bouché-Leclercq	*Histoire de la Divination dans L'Antiquité*, Paris, 1879.
Bousset	*Die Religion des Judentums*, 3rd ed. (Gressmann), 1926.
Charles	*Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Test.*
Cumont	Art. "ὕψιστος," in *Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll Encykl.*
Dalman, G.	Art. "Gottesdienst" (Synagogaler), in *Realency. für Prot. Theologie u. Kirche. Herzog-Hauck*, Leipzig, 1899.
,, ,,	*Aramäische Dialektproben*, 2nd ed., 1927.
Deissmann, A.	*Licht vom Osten*, Tübingen, 1909.
Derenbourg	*Essai sur l'histoire et la géographie de la Palestine, etc.*, 1867.
Dibelius, Martin	*Die urchristliche Überlieferung von Joh. dem Täufer*, Göttingen, 1911.
Dillmann	Art. "Kirchweihfest," in *Schenkels Bibel Lexikon*, Band iii.

Dix, G. H.	"The Seven Archangels and the Seven Spirits" (*Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. xxviii. 1927).
Eadie	*Ecclesiastical Encyclopædia.*
Edersheim, A.	*Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah.*
Eisele	Art. "Sabazius," in *Roschers Ausführliches Lexikon der Griechischen und Römischen Mythologie.*
Fascher, Emil	"Προφήτης," 1927, *Eine sprach- und religionsgesch. Untersuchung.*
Fiebig, Paul	*Mischnah-Traktat Rosh-ha-shana.*
,, ,,	*Mischnah-Traktat Berachoth.*
Frazer	*Folklore in the Old Testament*, vol. iii. ("Keepers of the Threshold").
Geiger, Wilhelm	*Ostiranische Kultur im Altertum*, 1882.
Goldschmidt	*Der babylonische Talmud*, Bd. i., "Sabbath."
Grätz	*History of the Jews.*
Gray, Buchanan	*Sacrifice in the Old Testament*, Oxford, 1925.
Gressmann, H.	"Das religionsgeschichtliche Problem des Ursprungs der hellenistischen Erlösungsreligion" (*Zeitschrift für Kirchengesch.*, Bd. xli., neue Folge, iv. 1922).
,, ,,	*Tod u. Auferstehung d. Osiris—nach Festbräuchen u. Umzügen*, Bd. xxiii. 3. Heft in "Der alte Orient" series.
,, ,,	"The Mysteries of Adonis and the Feast of Tabernacles," *Expositor*, 1925, ninth series, vol. iii.
,, ,,	*Die hellenistische Gestirnreligion*, Leipzig, 1925. (Beiheft zum alt. Orient.)
,, ,,	*Die Aufgaben der Wissenschaft des nachbiblisch. Judentums*, Giessen, 1925.
Gunkel	"Genesis," in *Schr. d. A.T.*, Bd. i.
Haller, M.	"Das Judentum," in *Schr. d. A.T.*, Bd. ii. 3.
Hamburger	Art. "Weihfest," in *Real Encykl. für Bibel u. Talmud.*, 1883.
,,	Arts. "Zauberei," "Licht," "Leuchter," "Trauer," "Mesusa," in *Real Encykl. des Judentums*, 1896.

Hausleiter, J.	Art. "Hasmonäer" (E. Reuss), *Herzog-Hauck*, Leipzig.
Hefele	*History of the Councils*, Engl. trans.
Hippolytus	"De Christo et Antichristo," Migne, *Patrolog.*, Cursus completus x.
Hochfeld	*Entstehung des Hanukkahfestes. Zeitschr. für Alttest. Wiss.*, 1902.
Hölscher	*Sanhedrin-Makkoth. Traktat.*
,,	*Der Sadduzäismus, eine kritische Untersuchung zur späteren jüdischen Religionsgeschichte*, Leipzig, 1906.
Holtzmann, H. J.	"Evangelium, Briefe, und Offenbarung des Johannes" (*Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament*, Bd. iv.).
Huart, Clément	*Ancient Persia and Iranian Civilisation*, 1927.
Ideler	*Handbuch der mathematischen und technischen Chronologie*, Berlin, 1826.
Jastrow, Marcus	*A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli, and Yerushalmi and the Midrashic Literature*, London and New York, 1903.
Jeremias, A.	"Ninib," in *Roschers Ausführliches Lexikon der Griech. und Römischen Myth.*
,, ,,	*Das Alte Testament im Lichte des alten Orients.*
Jessen	Art. "Helios," *Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll Realencycl. d. klass. Altertumswissensch.*, 1912.
Jewish Encyclopædia	Art. "Lamp," vol. vii.
,, ,,	Art. "Mourning."
Kautzsch	*Apokryphen und Pseudep. d. A.T.*
Keil	*Die Kulte Lydiens* (*Anatolian Studies* presented to Sir W. Ramsay), 1923.
Kern, O.	*Arch. für Religionswissenschaft*, xxii. 1923–1924; Mitteilungen und Hinweise, p. 198 f.; "Ein vergessenes Dionysosfest in Jerusalem."
Kittel, Rudolf	*Die hellenistische Mysterienreligion und das Alte Testament*, Berlin, 1924.
Kohut	*Über die jüdische Angelologie und Dämonologie, usw.*, Leipzig, 1866.
Kolbe, W.	*Beiträge zur syrischen und jüdischen Geschichte, Kritische Untersuchungen zur Seleukidenliste und zu den beiden Makkabäerbüchern*, Leipzig, 1925.

Krauss, S.	"La Fête de Hanoucca," *Revue des Études juives*, tome xxx., 1895.
"	"Encore un mot sur la Fête de Hanoucca," *R.E.J.*, tome ii., 1896.
Krüger	*Abodah Zarah. Traktat.*
Lackeit	"Aion, Zeit, und Ewigkeit," in *Sprache und Religion*, Königsberg, 1916.
Levi, Israel	"Hanoucca et le jus primæ noctis," *R.E.J.*, tome xxx.
" "	"Encore un mot sur la Fête de Hanoucca," *R.E.J.*, tome xxxi., 1895.
Liber, M.	*Rev. des Études juives*, 1912, tome lxxiii., "Hanoucca et Souccot," p. 20 f.
Lietzmann, Hans	*Der Weltheiland*, Bonn, 1909.
Lightfoot	*Horæ Hebraicæ*, Gospel according to St. John.
Maimonides	*Hilkoth Megilla wa-Hanukkah.*
Malten	"Hephaistos," art. in *Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll Realencycl. d. klass. Altertumswiss.*, 1912.
Meyer, Eduard	*Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, Bd. i.–iii., 1924.
Montgommery, J. A.	*The Samaritans, the Earliest Jewish Sect, their History, Theology, and Literature*, Philadelphia, 1907.
Moulton	*Early Zoroastrianism*, Hibbert Lectures, 1912.
Neubauer, Adr.	"Megillath Taʿanith," in *Anecdota Oxoniensia*, Sem. series (Parts IV.–VI.), Mediæval Jewish Chronicles.
Niese	*Kritik der beiden Makkabäerbücher*, Berlin, 1900 (*Hermes*, Bd. xxxv. p. 268 f.).
Nilsson, Martin P.	"Die Hellenistische Mysterienreligion u. das Alte Testament" (von Kittel), *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, neue Folge, 3. Jahrgang, Heft 23, June 1926.
" "	*Die Religion der Griechen*, Tübingen, 1927.
Norden, Eduard	*Die Geburt des Kindes, Geschichte einer religiösen Idee*, Teubner, Leipzig–Berlin, 1924.
Novack	*Mishnah-Traktat Sabbath.*
Nowack	*Lehrbuch des hebräischen Archäologie*, Bd. i. ii.

Oehler . . . . “Feste der späteren Juden,” *Herzogs Realencykl. für Protest. Theologie u. Kirche*, 2nd ed.

„ . . . . “Feste der alten Hebräer,” *Herzogs Realencykl.*

Olmstead . . . . . *American Journal of Theology*, vol. xxiv. Jan. 1920, on 2 Maccabees iv. 12 (art. “Wearing the Hat.”).

Ottley, R. . . . . . . *A Handbook to the Septuagint*, 1919.

Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll . (*Realencykl. der klass. Altertumswiss.*)—
Articles : “Dionysus,” Kern, Bd. v.
“Dithryambos,” Waser.
“Epheu.”
“Dikē,” Thalheim.
“Apollon,” Wernicke, 1896.
“Αἰών,” Wernicke, 1894.
“Altar,” Reisch, 1894.
“Antiochus Epiphanes,” Wilcken, 1894.
“Ἔμπυρα (σήματα), Stengel, 1905.
“Ἀγυιεύς,” Wenzel.
“Ἀγυιεὺς βωμός,” Reisch, 1894.
“Ἀπελλαῖος,” Kubitschek.
“Dusares,” Cumont, 1905.

Pfister . . . . . Art. “Kultus,” in *Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll*, 1912.

Pohlenz . . . . . Art. “Kronos,” in *Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll.*

Ramsay, W. . . . . *Manual of Roman Antiquities*, 1859.

Reitzenstein . . . . *Das iranische Erlösungsmysterium*, 1921.

„ . . . . *Die Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen*, Leipzig, 1927.

Rhode . . . . . . *Psyche.*

Riehm . . . . . . *Handwörterbuch des biblischen Altertums*, 1884.

„ . . . . Art. on “Kirchweihfest.”

„ . . . . Art. on “Einweihung.”

Rothstein . . . . . *Megilla Traktat.*

Saintyves . . . . . *Essais de Folklore Biblique, Le Feu qui descend du ciel, etc.*, Paris, 1923.

Schmalz . . . . . . “Das heilige Feuer in der Grabeskirche im Zusammenhang mit der kirchlichen Liturgie und den antiken Lichtriten” (*Palästina Jahrbuch*, 1917, Dalman).

Schroeder, L. von . . *Arische Religion*, vols. i., ii., Leipzig, 1923.

Schürer, E.	"Über die Juden im bosporanischen Reiche und die Genossenschaften der *σεβόμενοι θεὸν ὕψιστον* ebendaselbst," 1897, *Sitzungsbericht d. kgl. Akad. d. Wiss. z. Berlin.*
Schwally	*Leben nach dem Tode*, 1892.
Smith, Robertson	*The Old Testament in the Jewish Church.*
Söderblom	*La Vie future d'après le Mazdéism.*
Strack	*Schabbath. Traktat.*
Strack u. Billerbeck	*Das Evangelium nach Markus, Lukas, u. Johannes u. die Apostelgeschichte erläutert aus Talmud u. Midrash*, Bd. ii., München, 1924.
Surenhusius	(*Mishnah*), *Rosh-ha-shana, Sukkah, Berakoth, Bikkurim, Megillah, Maaser Sheni, Shabbath, Moed Katan, Taʿanith*, etc.
Thackeray, St. John	*Septuagint and Jewish Worship: A Study in Origins*, 1921 (Schweich Lectures, 1920).
Thomson, R. Campbell	*Semitic Magic, its Origins and Development*, 1908, in Luzac's Oriental Religions Series.
Venetianer, L.	"Ursprung und Bedeutung der Propheten Lektionen," in *Z.D.M.G.*, Bd. lxiii., Leipzig, 1909.
Weber, W.	"Das Kronosfest in Durostorum," *Arch. f. Rel. Wiss.*, xix. 1916–1919.
Wellhausen, J.	"Über den geschichtlichen Wert des 2 Makkabäerbuches im Verhältnis zum ersten," 1905, *Nachr. d. Ges. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen.*
Whittaker, Th.	*Macrobius, or Philosophy, Science, and Letters in the Year 400*, Cambridge University Press, 1923.
Wilrich	*Juden und Griechen vor der makkabäischen Erhebung*, Göttingen, 1895.
Windfuhr, Walter	*Mischnah-Traktat Baba Qamma.*
Winer	*Biblisches Realwörterbuch.*, art. on "Kirchweihfest."
Wissowa	Art. "Saturnus," in *Roschers Ausführliches Lexikon der Griechischen u. Römischen Mythologie.*
Wünsche	*Die Pesikta des Rab Kahana*, Leipzig, 1884.

ABBREVIATIONS

P.-W.	Pauly-Wissowa (Kroll), *Realencyklopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft.*
B.Q.	*Baba Qamma* (*kamma*).
Rosh-hash.	*Rosh-hashanah.*
Sab.	*Sabbath.*
Suk.	*Sukkah.*
Sanh.	*Sanhedrin.*
Ber.	*Berakoth.*
Bik.	*Bikkurim.*
Taʿan.	*Taʿanith.*
Meg. Taʿan.	*Megillath Taʿanith.*
Hilk. Meg. wa-Han.	*Hilkoth Megillah wa-Hanukkah.*
1 M. (2 M.)	First (Second) Book of Maccabees.
Z.A.W.	*Zeitschrift für Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft.*
Z.D.M.G.	*Zeitschrift der Morgenländischen Gesellschaft.*
G. d. K.	*Die Geburt des Kindes* (Norden).
I.E.R.	*Das iranische Erlösungsmysterium* (Reitzenstein).
R.E.J.	*Revue des Études juives.*
Nachr.	*Nachrichten der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaft zu Göttingen,* 1905. *Über den geschichtlichen Wert des 2 Makkabäerbuches im Verhältnis zum ersten* (Wellhausen).
Z.K.G.	*Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte.*
J.O.T.S.	*Journal of Theological Studies.*

CHAPTER I

THE SOURCES

CHAPTER I

THE SOURCES

THE sources for the study of the festival of Hanukkah may be classified as follows:

1. The first two books of Maccabees (cf. 1 M. iv. 36–59; 2 M. i. 9, 10, ii. 19, x. 1–8), and the description which Josephus gives in *Ant.* xii. 7. 6, 7.

2. The references to the festival in the Mishnah are (see Appendix I.): Baba kamma vi. 6; Bikkurim i. 6; Rosh hashanah i. 3; Taʿanith ii. 10; Megillah iii. 4, 6; Moed Katan iii. 9.

However small may be the contribution to the study of Hanukkah from these passages, what is yielded, while authoritative for the first two centuries A.D., may be taken as evidence for the customs of Judaism in the first pre-Christian century. To these references must be added the Aramaic text of Megillath Taʿanith (§ 23), the chronicle of these days on which, in memory of joyous occasions, especially of the Maccabean period, fasting is forbidden. This text is mentioned in the Mishnah (Taʿanith ii. 8), and was composed probably before the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, but at latest at the beginning of the second century (Strack, *Einleitung in den Talmud*, 4th ed. p. 13; Schürer, *Gesch. d. jüd. Volk.*, 4th ed. Bd. i. p. 156 f.; Derenbourg, *Essai*, p. 2, note 2). St. John's Gospel x. 22 mentions the festival.

3. The Hebrew commentary to Megillath Taʿanith (Meg. Tan. ix.), the Talmud (Sab. 21, b), Pesikta Rabbati (ii.) communicate the legends of

the origin of the custom of lighting lamps on Hanukkah, and exhibit the mark of later reflection. For the custom of the lights, Meg. Tan. supplies, however, useful evidence, and much that its scholia in general convey is valuable.

4. Maimonides (A.D. 1135–1204) in *Hilkoth Megillah wa-Hanukkah*, chapters iii. and iv. in the third book of the Mishnēh Torah, describes at length the observance of the festival in post-Talmudic times, and gives full description of the ritual of the Hanukkah-lamp. As far as this work can be shown to preserve the oldest tradition of the ritual of the lamp throughout Jewry (cf. iii. 3, iv. 3–10), we have a more certain clue to the origin of the festival, as festival "of lights" (φῶτα, Jos. *Ant.* xii. 7. 7), than the Midrashic legend of the festival can offer.

5. Of the portions of Scripture read in the synagogues to commemorate the festival, the reading from the Law, Num. vii., and the Haphtarah lesson (Zech. ii. 10 (A.V.) to iv. 7), have at least interpretative value. English commentators, St. John Thackeray remarks, have, in interpreting the Jewish festivals, unduly neglected the lessons in use on special occasions, not regarding them as a factor in exegesis; but though not committed to writing before (at earliest) the second century A.D., there is reason to believe the tradition of some of these readings was inherited orally from earlier generations.[1] The lessons were selected as deemed suitable for bringing before the worshippers the chief ideas of the festival celebrated.

Alongside of the Scripture passages for Hanukkah must also be placed the fragments of homilies upon the festival, contained in the Pesikta of Rab Kahana, which is accounted by some critics as among the oldest Midrashim, or as employing very ancient materials.

---

[1] *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship: A Study in Origins* (Schweich Lectures, 1920), p. 40.

6. The Jewish literature which immediately precedes or falls within the Maccabean age, and which reflects either the historical background of the festival or represents the world of thought in which the festival arose, might be expected to shed light upon it. If there are elements of Hellenistic religious thought and cultus which penetrated Judaism and appear in Jewish guise in Hanukkah, some trace of them may be discoverable in literature of the period—the Wisdom of Sirach, Daniel, 1 Enoch, the Book of Jubilees, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, the Damascus-text,[1] and the third book of Sibylline Oracles. The authors of 1 and 2 M., though giving direct testimony to the institution of Hanukkah, and drawing from older records of Maccabean history, are further removed from the atmosphere of thought and struggle in which our festival was born, than are the Book of Daniel and portions of 1 Enoch.

Since so much must be founded on the two books of Maccabees, in an investigation of the origins of the festival of Hanukkah, it is necessary to take account of the literary criticism of these two sources, so far as that affects our subject.

The judgment of scholars has in the main been favourable to 1 M. both as regards its character as an historical work, and its proximity to the period it describes. Bousset (*R. d. Jud.*, p. 16; cf. note 2) calls it the best historical work which Judaism has produced, and agreeing with Kautzsch (p. 29, *Apok.*, Bd. i.) on the probability of xiv. 15 being the original conclusion of the work, holds that it must have been written before the decline of the Hasmonean dynasty in its last representatives, and perhaps much earlier. Even Niese,[1] whose thesis is that 2 M. is the older and often purer source, and who reckons to 1 M. in its original form the passage subsequent to xiv. 15 which refers to John Hyrkanus (cf. 1 M. xvi. 23, 24), declares the author to have written between 104–63 B.C. On the supposition that 1 M. closed with xiv. 15, it might seem possible that the author wrote in the reign of Hyrkanus (135–105 B.C.). But as mention is made of the tomb raised by Simon in Modein, as existing "unto this day" (xiii. 30), and from the poetic description of the reign of this prince (xiv. 4 f.), the impression is gained of a considerable period having elapsed between the events recorded and the time of 1 M.'s composition. On this consideration, Kautzsch (*Einleitung*, *Apok.*, 1 M. Bd. i.) says we must be content to place 1 M. in the first decades of the last century B.C. On the other hand, Oesterley (Charles, *Apoc.*, 1 M., Introd.) believes that these details of Simon's reign appear to indicate the author was an eye-witness of what he describes, that he probably gathered his materials as early as the reign of Simon, and that the work was completed "somewhere during the last quarter of the second century B.C." As Oesterley, however, includes the reference of 1 M., which seems to imply the death of John Hyrkanus (xvi. 23, 24), it would appear that, if this reference is to be included in the original work, the composition of the book must be set after 100 B.C., but before the advent of the Romans under Pompey, 63 B.C., of which, if it had occurred, some indication might be expected. Moderate opinion seems to incline towards the former date rather than to the latter.

---

[1] "Fragments of a Zadokite Work," according to Charles, composed after 18 B.C. (*Pseudep.*, vol. ii. p. 788). Cf. Bousset, *Rel. d. Jud.*, p. 15, note 5: "Die Meinungen über ihr Verständnis und ihre Datierung gehen noch weit auseinander, doch haben sich die meisten Forscher für die Makkabäerzeit ausgesprochen."

---

[1] *Kritik der beiden Makkabäerbücher*, Berlin, 1900 (reprinted from Hermes, Bd. 35, pp. 268–307, 453–527), p. 8 f.

Before making closer comparison of 1 and 2 M., and estimating the reliance we may place upon each, the question of their relationship can be approached, by inquiry into the chronology they employ, as this concerns the date of the institution of our festival. The criticism of the books of the Maccabees, with the issues rising from it, has recently undergone a further stage in a very thorough investigation by Walter Kolbe, Professor of Ancient History (Greifswald), in his *Beiträge zur syrischen und jüdischen Geschichte* (Leipzig, 1926). He brings proof to show that the chronology prevailing in 1 M. is that of the era beginning in the spring, 311 B.C. Niese, Wellhausen, and E. Meyer regard the autumn-era of 312 B.C. to be in use in 1 M., while Schürer, with the general consensus of critics (Kautzsch, *Apok.*, Bd. i. p. 31), decides for a spring-era of 312 B.C.[1] Kolbe defends the thesis of Unger. For a spring-era, the much-debated passage (1 M. x. 21), "And Jonathan put on the holy garment in the seventh month of the 160th year, at the feast of Booths," speaks most strongly. If the year Sel. 160 had begun in the autumn (Tishri), then in this short period of 1–15th Tishri, according to x. 1–20, we have to place the rising under Alexander Balas, the taking of Ptolemais, the preparations on the part of Demetrius I., his negotiating with Jonathan, Jonathan's arrival in Jerusalem, the agreement of Jonathan with the garrison, the beginning of the building of the city, the coming of the news to Alexander of Demetrius' promises, the consequent dispatch of letters from Alexander, appointing Jonathan to the high-priesthood. All this did not happen in a fortnight. But if the year began with 1 Nisan, there is the more probable period of seven months in which these events could occur. Kolbe also shows that the report of Polybius (cf. xxxiii. 15; 18. 6) of the journey of Balas and Herakleides to obtain the consent of the Roman senate to Balas' claim to the throne, is acknowledgedly an account of the year, autumn 153 to autumn 152 B.C., and that the proceedings in Rome, the return thence, the capture of Ptolemais, and the subsequent diplomacy cannot be crowded into the period between the late summer (ἔτι τῆς θερείας ἀκμαζούσης, Polyb. *ut sup.*), 153, when Herakleides arrived in Rome, and October (Booths) 153. The autumn-festival of Booths, Sel. 160, therefore, on which Jonathan appears as high-priest, is that of the spring-year, 152 B.C. to 151 B.C., which means that the era began in spring, 311 B.C.

---

[1] Kolbe, *ut sup.*, p. 19 f.

Of the several passages in 1 M. which Kolbe adduces in support of a spring-era, the one just cited has been chosen because of its testimony to an era starting 311 B.C. The date of Hanukkah now falls to be examined. According to 1 M. i. 20 f., Epiphanes, after his successful Egyptian campaign, marches upon Jerusalem, Sel. 143, and plunders the Temple. If we reckoned from April 312 B.C., this event would belong to the year 170–169 B.C. Schürer, Wellhausen, and others (see Kolbe, p. 34) indeed place it in 170 B.C. The inaccuracy of this calculation Niese (*Kritik*, p. 90 f.) demonstrated by drawing upon Polybius' account (xxviii. 1. 7) of the Egyptian mission to Rome before the outbreak of the war. The embassy arrives in Rome Ol. 152(3) = autumn-year, 170–169 B.C., at a time when the Consul Q. Marcius had departed on the expedition against Perseus. As Marcius had entered upon office in March 169 B.C., this leaves, as Meyer

(*Ursprung*, Bd. ii. p. 151, note 2) points out, the early summer for the embassy's arrival, and the summer 169 B.C. for Antiochus' attack on Egypt. This latter event with its date, 143 Sel. = 169 B.C., excludes the possibility of a spring-era of 312 B.C., though, as the campaign fell in the summer, the question of an autumn- as against a spring-year cannot be decided. But if a spring-era is to be taken as proven for 1 M., then the fact that the campaign of 169 B.C. fell in 143 Sel. shows that the author reckons from Nisan, 311 B.C. Now from the fixed point, 169 B.C. = Sel. 143 (1 M. i. 20), for Antiochus' return from Egypt and plundering of the Temple, we further establish the date of the profanation of the altar (1 M. i. 54, i. 29, Sel. 145; Jos. *Ant.* xii. 7. 6) on 25th Kislev to be 167 B.C., and the cleansing of the Temple in that month three years after (1 M. iv. 52, Sel. 148; Jos. *Ant. ibid.*), to have occurred in Kislev, 164 B.C. In respect of 2 M., which as a rule avoids exact dates, and in which some have thought there is a different system of dating than that used in 1 M., the spring-era, 311 B.C., is also the mode of reckoning employed. 2 M. x. 5 reports only the day and the month, 25th Kislev, for the cleansing of the Temple. But as, in xiii. 1, the author proceeds to the events of the year Sel. 149, there is indication that in the preceding description of the restoration of the cultus, he is referring to the year Sel. 148. Such differences as exist between 1 and 2 M. regarding dates are not due to a different era being in use. In both books there is agreement in dating (1 M. vii. 1; cf. 2 M. xiv. 4, Sel. 151; 1 M. vii. 1, 43, Nicanor's death; cf. 2 M. xv. 28, 37, xiv. 4, Sel. 151). Where 2 M. differs in chronology from 1 M., this is due to the former's misplacement, according to Kolbe the purposeful misplacement (*in einer ganz bewussten*

Verschiebung, p. 44) of the year of the death of Epiphanes, and consequently of the campaign of Lysias, which depends thereon.

This reflection on the character of 2 M. brings us to the consideration of another of Kolbe's conclusions, namely, that in 2 M. we have not only the work of the Epitomist, but chapters i.–ii. 18 and the letters in chapter xi. are the insertions of another, a forger (*Fälscher*). Since the first passage characterizes the festival of Hanukkah, and yields considerable evidence concerning the origins of the festival, the reason for regarding 2 M. i.–ii. 18 and the letters of chapter xi. as being from another hand, which added them later to the Epitomist's writing, a composition which itself has been given by some critics a very late date (Kamphausen in *Kautzsch Pseudep.*, Bd. ii. p. 84, "perhaps the beginning of the Christian era"; Willrich, *Juden und Griechen*, pp. 64–125, after A.D. 70; Bousset, *Rel. d. Jud.*, p. 32, "in the Roman period"), is of vital importance. For if, as Schürer states (*Gesch. d. Jüdisch. Volkes*, 4th ed. Bd. i. p. 196, note 30; cf. Willrich, *ut sup.*, p. 65), 2 M. itself is an impure source (*eine trübe Quelle*) which can be used only in lack of a better, its nature is further impugned if Kolbe's conclusion is justified. The latter, however, regards the excision of the above-mentioned portions as a separation of the dross from the purer metal.

The belief that the documents in chapter xi. are genuine, defended by Niese (p. 63 f.) and regarded by him as showing the superiority of 2 M. to 1 M., was supported by Laqueur (*Kritische Untersuchungen zum 2ten Makkabäerbuch*), who strengthened Niese's argument by the admission of the intrusion of an unhistorical element. The witness in the second and third letters of 2 M. xi. (vers. 23, 33) to the death of Epiphanes as occurring before Xanthicus

Sel. 148 (164 B.C.), is contradicted by 1 M., and the statements of Eusebius as confirmed by cuneiform inscriptions. 1 M. vi. 16 (Jos. *Ant.* xii. 9. 2) places the death of Epiphanes in the year 149 Sel., that is, in the spring-year, 163–162 B.C., and Granius Licinianus (p. 9, ed. Bonn) establishes this also by his note, "Graccho iterum consule" (cf. Polyb. xxxi. 1. 6; Kolbe, pp. 52, 88). Laqueur met this difficulty with the assumption, also made by Wellhausen (*Nachr. d. Gött. Ges. d. Wiss.*, 1905, p. 142), and Meyer (*Ursprung*, Bd. ii. p. 212), that the words in the second letter recording Epiphanes' death, "Now that our father has passed over to the Gods," are an interpolation in a genuine document. We may omit here from consideration the defence the documents of chapter xi. have received from Meyer (Bd. ii. Beilage, p. 458), who holds them to be genuine records which Jason himself manipulated because he overlooked that Eupator had been made king already in his father's lifetime, and falsely concluded that Epiphanes had died. Also must be passed over the argument of Kolbe that all of the letters of this chapter are fabrications—a thesis in which he is in agreement with Moffatt (Charles, *Apoc.*, p. 127),[1] and with the doubt expressed by Schürer (*Gesch.*, Bd. iii. p. 484, note 26), who states that it seems to him very questionable whether criticism is on the right path in accepting the letters (2 M. xi. 16 f.) as authentic. One fact, however, clearly emerges from examination of the letters in the eleventh chapter of 2 M.—they form a group of epistles inserted by the same hand, and, as represented by the third and second letter (undated, but of the same content and time as the third), combine in the same construction of history as we find in the introductory letters (or letter), 2 M. i.–ii. 18, according to which Epiphanes dies before the Jews celebrate the cleansing of the Temple in Kislev, Sel. 148. These two portions, 2 M. i.–ii. 18 and the letters 2 M. xi., regarded as a literary entity, are in agreement with one another as to the time of Epiphanes' death, and also in obvious conflict with the rest of the book as to the manner of his fate. In 2 M. i. 12 f., Antiochus purposes to plunder the temple of Nanaia in Persia, under the pretext of constituting the ἱερὸς γάμος with the Goddess. The priests let him into the temple, but open a trap-door in the roof and stone him; his body is then beheaded, and the head cast forth to the awaiting Syrians. In 2 M. ix. the king intends to despoil the temple of Nanaia, but suffers defeat and turns then his wrath against the Jews. Disease causes him to alter his intention and to resolve to offer the Jews religious freedom. He then expires in great suffering. The contrast between the two reports cannot be removed, and the attempt of Niese (p. 19) to remove it by the improbable supposition (cf. Wellhausen, *Nachr.*, p. 119 f.) that in the first chapter of 2 M. the reference is to the death of Antiochus VII. Sidetes (138–128 B.C.) shows how insuperable the contrast is. Chapters i.–ii. 18, Kolbe therefore supposes (p. 122), were written to prepare the way for the fabricated letters of chapter xi., and for the account there given of the change of Syrian policy towards the Jews in the reign of Eupator, in consequence of the defeat of Lysias, by representing that the council who ordered the celebration of the festival (ii. 16) had already knowledge of Epiphanes' death. But we have perhaps more reason to believe that the too previous dating of Epiphanes' end, common to 2 M. i.–ii. 18 and xi., sprung from the desire to let retribution fall as early as possible upon the sacrilegious king, and to acknowledge as little as possible as due to his change of policy or clemency. From this theological standpoint the more dramatic tradition of Epiphanes' death held preference.[1] For Josephus (*Ant.* xii. 9. 1), too, the death of Epiphanes is the signal vindication of the Pharisaic doctrine of retribution, and he inveighs against Polybius for asserting that "Antiochus died because he had a purpose to plunder the temple of Diana," rather than assigning his death to his actually plundering the Temple at Jerusalem.

---

[1] Moffatt, *ad loc.*: "At most they reflect an historical nucleus, but in their present form the epistles of xi. 16 f. are almost entirely manufactured documents like those of i.–ii."

Kolbe's view that 2 M. i.–ii. 18 and 2 M. xi. are from the same author, and are not the work of Jason, appears to be certain, but his argument, from the contrast which these chapters present in relation to the body of the book in which they are placed, that they do not originate with the Epitomist is not well founded. In ii. 19, which belongs admittedly to the Epitomist's foreword, we have the same purpose of writing which pervades the procemium, namely, to relate the story of the restoration of the cultus (*τὸν τοῦ ἱεροῦ τοῦ μεγίστου καθαρισμὸν καὶ τὸν τοῦ βωμοῦ ἐγκαινισμόν*). That "there is no bridge leading from the letter to the history proper" (Laqueur, *Kolbe*, p. 122) is true when we merely regard the change of literary form, but not so when the inner purpose and thought is taken into account (ii. 16; cf. ii. 19). The connexion at ii. 19 with the foregoing letters (or letter) is in the circumstances as skilful as the connexion at iii. 1 is artistic and impressive. Nor are the introductory letters prejudiced in the claim made for them, that they are from the hand of the Epitomist, by the words, (ii. 32), *τοῖς προειρημένοις τοσοῦτον ἐπιζεύξαντες*. To interpret these as Kolbe does, as intending, "I shall content myself with these short remarks" (p. 119), and thus proving that, when written, the procemium of considerable length did not attach to the work, is to strain the sense. They mean no more than, "We have no more to add by way of preface" (Moffatt), and indeed verse 32 may be understood as betraying a certain consciousness of the author of having tarried too long before beginning his epitome.[1] Even if *τοῖς προειρημένοις* refer only to ii. 19 f., no conclusion adverse to the procemium can be drawn, for the letters (or letter) are the authoritative seal of the work—i. 10b–ii. 18 actually purports to be from Judas and the Council, 164 B.C. (cf. Meyer, p. 210, note 1, 455, Bd. ii.)—and the author, even if he had fabricated them entirely, could not claim them as his own remarks. Again, although the divergence in historical standpoint which characterizes chapters i.–ii. and xi. marks them off from the others, we are not thereby entitled to see the shadow of another author, a forger behind the Epitomist. For the latter lacks nothing in frankness and geniality in describing the task he is performing. In ii. 29 he plainly intimates that while Jason is the architect of the structure of the history, he himself undertakes the furnishing (*ἐνκαινίζειν*, *vide infra*) and ordering, and the painting (*ζωγραφεῖν*) or portraiture. Here he reveals his intention, which is not limited to correcting style, but is a claim to independence of presentation.

---

[1] In 2 M. vi. 12 f., where the "I" leads us to think the Epitomist himself is speaking (cf. Wellhausen, *Nachr.*, p. 121), we see how important the doctrine of retribution is to him, and in particular the thought that God's kindness (where Israel is concerned) is shown "when the impious are not let alone for a long time, but punished at once."

---

[1] Cf. translation of verse 32 by Kamphausen: "So wollen wir denn jetzt, nachdem wir uns bei der Vorrede so lange aufgehalten haben, mit der Erzählung beginnen," p. 90, Kautzsch, *Apok.*, Bd. i.; also cf. Niese, p. 23.

The alteration of Jason's sequence of events, which Meyer and Kolbe both perceive, is doubtless his work.[1] The Epitomist placed his own stamp on his abridgment of Jason's *History*, and wove into it his own idea of the sequence of events, and probably even his own religious views (vi. 12–17, xii. 44, 45). Kamphausen (p. 85, Bd. i. Kautzsch, *Apok.*) would appear to do an injustice to the Epitomist's personality and independence when he remarks that the Epitomist was little concerned with historical accuracy, and that both legends of the king's death were so dear to him, that without taking responsibility to himself for either, he committed them to the preference of the reader. But this critic is certainly right in his observation that "what the letters possess in common with the rest of the book in language and content is of more weight than the apparent contradiction in regard to the death of the tyrant." In 2 M. i.–ii. 18 and xi., we have no reason to see trace of another than the Epitomist himself, who himself inserted them, and made Jason's work the vehicle of his purpose. What that purpose was, and what the character of 2 M. is, seem justly estimated by Hochfeld, who holds 2 M. "to be an epitome of the works of Jason of Cyrene, composed with the aim of setting forth the origin of the two celebrations, Hanukkah and the Nikanor-festival."[2] The former, as Ewald (*Gesch. d. Volkes Isr.*, 3rd ed. iv. 605 f.) pointed out, is described at the end of the first half of the epitome (x. 1–8), and the latter at the end of the second half (xv. 30–36). The author of the epitome prides himself in the Epilogue (xv. 37–39) on his skilful arranging (*εὐθίκτως τῇ συντάξει*) of his work, and his illustration of wine mixed with water, *οἶνος ὕδατι συνκερασθείς*, need not only refer to "good style blended with sound matter" (Moffatt, *ad loc.*), but to the interweaving of new elements which added point to the Jasonic history.

---

[1] According to Kolbe (p. 104) and Meyer (Bd. ii. p. 209, note 1; p. 233, note 2; p. 459), cap. x. 1–8 (cleansing of the sanctuary) in Jason's book preceded 2 M. ix. (report of Epiphanes' death).

[2] *Die Entstehung des Hanukkahfestes Z.A.W.*, 1902 (20 Jahrgang), p. 272: "Eine aus dem Werke Jasons von Kyrene (2 M. ii. 23) geflossene Epitome, zusammengestellt zu dem Zwecke die Entstehung der beiden Feiertage, Hanukkah, und Nikanorfest darzulegen."

Regarding 2 M. in its present form as essentially the work of the Epitomist, we must further consider the question of the date of 2 M., the sources of 1 and 2 M., the principle that must apply to the use of these books, and their historical value.

The variance of opinion on the date of 2 M. is very great. Niese accepted the date 188 Sel. (=125–124 B.C.), mentioned in the prooemium (i. 10a), as the time of composition. Although, as Wellhausen (*Nachr.*, p. 120) observes, this date, even if the letter were genuine, cannot be taken as index of the year of writing, Meyer (Bd. ii. p. 454 f.) holds to Niese's opinion. Bousset (*Rel. d. Jud.*, p. 32), because of the indication in i. 10b of the author's knowing the legend of Aristobulos, the teacher of King Ptolemy, places the work in the Roman period, probably before A.D. 40, certainly before A.D. 70. But Bousset bases his judgment on a question, itself debated (cf. Schürer, Bd. iii. p. 512 f.; Meyer, *Ursprung*, Bd. ii. p. 366), concerning Aristobulos and his identity (Bousset, *ut sup.*, p. 29). Moffatt (2 M., Charles, *Apoc.*), on account of a trace of anti-Hasmonean bias in the book, takes the breach of the Pharisees with that dynasty as clue to the date of composition, and settles upon 106 B.C., or even shortly before that. This is also approximately the time which Kolbe suggests (p. 123), namely, the turn of the second to the first century B.C., though he bases this in part upon the strong emphasis of the merits of the Hasmoneans as showing that this princely house was yet a power (p. 124). Again, from the standpoint of the theology of the writing, Moffatt says it represents the Pharisaic school of the latter half of the second century B.C., and he is in agreement with Charles (*Eschatology*, 1899, p. 230), who holds that its eschatological outlook "belongs essentially to the second century." But it was just the theology of 2 M. that led Kamphausen, and Kosters, who saw in 2 M. "an important contribution to the knowledge and thought of the later Pharisees" (Kautzsch, *Apok.*, Bd. i. p. 84), to give a very late date to its composition. The theological conceptions of the work therefore cannot form a foundation on which to base a judgment as to the time of composition of 2 M., nor is it possible always to discern between the conceptions of the Jasonic source and those of the Epitomist.

Although little importance can be attached to the date Sel. 188 (i. 10a) in the prœmium,[1] yet within the book itself there is evidence that it was written before Jerusalem passed through the experience of being conquered by Pompey. The statement in 2 M. xv. 37, "Such was the history of Nikanor; and as the city was held from that period by the Hebrews, etc.," though unhistorical and overlooking that Antiochus Sidetes captured the city in 133 B.C., shows at least that the city was not yet Roman. Also the fourth letter in chapter xi., that from the Romans to the nation of the Jews, however fictitious this document may be, could only have been indited in a situation when the Romans yet had attraction for the writer and his race. This is only possible if the Romans had still been at a distance. Here, then, in 63 B.C., we have a *terminus ante quem* for 2 M.'s composition. Whether we are entitled to postulate a date as early as 100 B.C., for the Epitomist's work, it is not possible to say, but with 63 B.C. as the point below which we cannot go, the dates of the writing of 2 and 1 M. do not appear to be far asunder.

---

[1] In i.–ii. 18, Niese, p. 13, sees one letter of date Sel. 188. Kolbe perceives (p. 116 f.) one letter of 148 Sel. (*i.e.* of the same year as letters in chapter xi.) following the rendering of i. 10a in codices 55 and 62, and regarding date 169 Sel. in i. 7 as an interpolation (pp. 112–114) due to the confusion of the latter Physkon, who persecuted the Jews (*circa* 80 B.C.) with the elder Physkon. Meyer (Bd. ii. p. 454 f.) and Laqueur break the prœmium of 2 M. into three letters. Most detect only two (Schürer, Bd. iii. pp. 485, 488).

While Niese succeeded in rehabilitating 2 M. in the estimation of scholars, and in showing that in certain particulars the Epitomist's work is more reliable than 1 M., he did not succeed in proving that 2 M. takes first place in respect of historical credibility, or is prior in date of composition. Neither is Laqueur's view justified, that in 2 M. we have two unequal sources—the first, which provides the documents of chapter xi. and is superior to 1 M., and the second of small value, which derives from Jason. The right distinction between the Epitomist's own work and that of Jason is rather made in attributing chapters i.–ii. and xi. to the Epitomist, and the rest, with the exceptions of some rearrangement and additions, to Jason. We have therefore now to advert to the question of the sources which Jason and 1 M. employed. The authors of 1 and 2 M. seem to be independent of one another (Wellhausen, *Nachr.*, p. 158). But was 1 M. independent of Jason? Meyer (Bd. ii. p. 458) observes that with 1 M., Jason's narrative has often very close contact, in the account of many individual details, and particularly in the arrangement of events. The *ἀκολουθία τῶν πραγμάτων* in both books is essentially identical. This, Meyer regards as demonstrating beyond doubt a common original source, even if that source has been used by Jason and the author of 1 M. in a different manner. But the opinion of Schlatter (*Jason von Kyrene*, 1891) that Jason's history is actually the common source behind both 1 and 2 M. receives anew the support of Kolbe (p. 136 f.), who subjects both these writings to the test of a comparative analysis. Both books, according to Kolbe, draw from a much wider and completer work, both giving the fragments that appeared attractive to them. 1 M. is more chronologically exact, confining himself to events (*sachlicher*), while 2 M. is prone to moral reflections, and leaves the connecting links of the narrative loose, as in the account of the plundering of the temple (1 M. i. 16–40; 2 M. v. 11–25). In their account of Nikanor's defeat (1 M. iii. 27–iv. 25; 2 M. viii. 8–36) Kolbe (p. 142) asserts that we have, on the one hand, astonishing agreement in regard to facts, and in the narrative-plan, on the other, a number of differences which can be traced to the individual taste of the authors, but that the evidence leads to the supposition of a common source. Differences also between 1 and 2 M. which appear at first sight strange, if both go back to a common source, have their inner and sufficient reason. The Bacchides-episode, for instance, 1 M. vii. 8–20, is not in 2 M. Bacchides' policy was to persuade the Hasidim at the Rabbinical conference to recognize Alkimos, the instrument of the Syrian power, as high-priest. This the Hasidim did. But the Epitomist of 2 M., in his Pharisaic conception of the Hasidim as the foes of compromise, could not record this. In both 1 and 2 M. we have tendentious writings. In 1 M. there is a one-sided patriotism. In 2 M. the religious interest minimizes Jewish defeats, and accounts for them by the intervention of Sabbatic years. But in the main, Kolbe contends, both books are of equal value, both drawing and giving incomplete excerpts from Jason, their source.

Wellhausen, in assessing the value of 2 M. in relation to 1 M., has given ample illustration of the complementary nature of both works, on the same method as does Kolbe, and the comparison makes it clear that the divergence in the representation of the history 1 and 2 M. record, has been much influenced by the factional interests of the authors. That 1 M. itself made use of Jason's history is not impossible, whether Jason's five books (2 M. ii. 23) extended merely to the death of Judas (Wellhausen, *Nachr.*, p. 121), or to the time of Jonathan's high-priesthood (Meyer, Bd. ii. p. 457). If Jason's own sources were largely oral tradition and evidence of eye-witnesses, as Meyer (*ibid.*) supposes, the close relationship between 1 and 2 M. would seem to support Schlatter's and Kolbe's opinion. But the phenomena, which Wellhausen's and Kolbe's analysis of the two books discloses, do not seem to compel us to go beyond Meyer's inference that Jason and the author of 1 M. used a common original source. The relationship between 1 and 2 M. is certainly closer than is caused by a narration of the same historical occurrences. "The differences are not always so great as they appear, the agreements on the other hand are often very marked, not only in detail, but also in whole narratives and their resultant facts" (Wellhausen, *ib.*, p. 158). It is this relationship between the two works that for our investigation will be seen to be of great importance, and justifies that "eclectic process" (*eklektisches Verfahren*) which Kolbe again affirms, and which Wellhausen had stated, as a principle applying to their use,[1] and which the latter himself employs in his theory of the origin of the festival of Hanukkah (*Nachr.*, p. 131). The separation of chapters i.–ii. and xi. of 2 M. from the work of Jason establishes this principle still more firmly.

---

[1] "Man müsse sie (die beiden Makkabäerbücher) von Fall zu Fall prüfen und darf sich vor eklektischem Verfahren nicht scheuen" (*Nachr.*, p. 158). Of this Schürer (Bd. i. 202, note 42) is sceptical.

Though 1 and 2 M. employ sources of the first rank, the Epitomist and the author of 1 M. themselves are removed by two generations or more from the year 164 B.C. It is only by comparison of the two writings, supported by data from other Jewish literature, that the picture of the religious history of Judaism, before, and at the beginning of, the Maccabean revolt, is kept from being obscured. The impression they tend to give is that Jason (*of Judea*) and the terrible Epiphanes were the first to launch Hellenization against Judaism, whereas in reality the king only succeeded, by his methods, in producing reaction to the cause he had so much at heart. 2 M. naively supposes that Hellenizing influences were first promoted by Jason (iv. 7 f.). But we may gather from 1 M. i. 11 that the idea of ridding Judaism from its exclusiveness had been widely spread, and that Jason was only a representative of that tendency. Again, while 2 M. iii.–iv. informs us that it was the Jewish aristocracy themselves who attempted Hellenization, 1 M. i. 10–15 does not even name Onias, Jason, or Menelaos. The author of 2 M., as Niese rightly says, exercises, in lesser degree than 1 M., "the art of silence," and reveals some data of importance for the study of the religious history of the period (*e.g.* 2 M. xii. 40, the portable idols of Jamnia, found upon Judas' men, (vi. 7) the monthly king's birthday, and the Dionysos festival).[1] 1 M., however, gives the valuable information (i. 41–51, ii. 19, iii. 29) that Epiphanes sought the religious uniformity of all his people, and directed his policy not only against the Jews. I M., too, gives a fuller account of the suppression of the Jewish cultus by the royal edict, the erection of the heathen altar on the Jewish altar of burnt-offering, the burning of the books of the Law, the sacrifices at the doors of the houses (1 M. i. 54), all of which 2 M. does not record.

---

[1] Niese, p. 52: "Er (1 M.) ist dringend verdächtig vieles absichtlich verschwiegen, geändert oder zugesetzt zu haben—während das 2 Makkabäerbuch seine Tendenzen zwar offener kundtut aber mit weniger Überlegung durchführt und namentlich die Kunst des Verschweigens in geringerem Masse übt."

The value of 1 and 2 M. it is thus seen is very great when their statements are combined. They assist each other in giving a truer account of the actual religious situation at the time of the outbreak of the revolt than could be obtained from either singly. But long before this, Hellenism had struck its roots deep into the nation—in the period that lies between Alexander the Great and Epiphanes. Kolbe (p. 155) points to the false perspective of 1 M. iii. 10, 13, which has led scholars to suppose that the whole might of the Syrian army was cast into the struggle against Judas. In reality the disturbance in Judea was of a minor and subordinate character, dealt with by the local military authorities, while Antiochus, with greater plans in mind and with the greater mass of his troops, Sel. 147, had crossed the Euphrates to meet the Parthian danger (Tac. *Hist.* v. 8). This view-point of 1 M. may be taken as analogous to the false perspective which 1 and 2 M. present, in spite of some corrective evidence within them, in respect of the religious influence of Hellenism. The edict of Antiochus, the special commissioner sent to enforce it (2 M. vi. 1), the Hellenizing schemes of Jason and Menelaos, are depicted as the first impact of foreign religion upon Judaism, when the holy city was inhabited in unbroken peace and "the laws were right strictly kept" (2 M. iii. 1) under the priesthood of the godly Onias. It is doubtless true that, in spite of the numerous Lawless and renegades, the Jews in general, "when religion and monotheism were placed in doubt, called a halt,"[1] and that even Jason was but a lax Jew, and had no desire to abolish the Jewish cultus. But in the Book of Sirach we may perceive the attempt to stem the tide of the forces (cf. xxxvi. 1–19, xxxv. 18 f.) which threatened faith, custom, and Law, and to recall the race to obedience to the Law. 2 M., which presents within itself such a puzzling contrast in the matter of the accounts of Epiphanes' death, and manifests the Pharisaic thought and spirit, is surely reporting in accordance with his source (iv. 33) when he records that Onias, who is portrayed as the leader of the pious, fled when in peril of his life to the sanctuary of Daphne, an immoral heathen shrine. We must not, with mistaken one-sidedness, overstress the fact which 1 and 2 M. reveal, that the nobles, the priests, the intellectual and aristocratic elements of the nation, were moderate Hellenizers, or moderately Hellenized (1 M. viii. 17; 2 M. iv. 11 f.; cf. Schürer, *Gesch.*, Bd. i. p. 189, note 17). For even before the Hasidim were stirred by persecution to action, their spirit must have been a living power within the people. There were those who would suffer death rather than profane the Sabbath by giving battle (1 M. ii. 32–38), and a community for whom was drawn the ideal picture of Daniel and his companions (Daniel i.) observing the Jewish food-laws even at the king's court. But it was Hellenism which produced that consciousness of the necessity of a breach with pagan culture, and created that Pharisaism, the פרישות, or separatism (*ἀμιξία*), which came to be afterwards practically synonymous with Judaism. From the time from Alexander onwards, Hellenic conceptions had found peaceful lodgment, and though not altering Jewish cultus or monotheism, made entrance not only in the sphere of thought, but, as investigation into the origins of Hanukkah may show, also in the realms of custom. Schürer (*Gesch.*, 4th ed. Bd. i. p. 189) states that "at the beginning of the second century (B.C.) the advance of Hellenism in Palestine must have been already fairly considerable." There is evidence, however, for a considerable contact of Judaism with foreign religious thought even before this. Some record of that gap in the period of Jewish history between Nehemiah and Antiochus Epiphanes, which Josephus fills in as best he could with almost entirely legendary matter, is the credible statement of Hekatæos of Abdera (*circa* 290 B.C.) in his work on Egypt, that under the Persian and Macedonian sovereignties the Jews had changed many of their customs (*πολλὰ τῶν πατρίων τοῖς 'Ιουδαίοις νομίμων ἐκινήθη*).[1]

---

[1] Wellhausen (*Nachr.*), p. 123: "Wenn die Religion und der Monotheismus in Frage zu kommen schien, machte man nicht mit."

---

[1] Cf. Willrich, *Juden und Griechen*, p. 51. Meyer, *Ursprung*, Bd. ii. p. 30: "Es ist ein sehr anschauliches und im wesentlichen zutreffendes Bild, das Hekataeos von den Juden gezeichnet hat. Von Gehässigkeit und Judenhass ist noch keine Rede."

CHAPTER II

HANUKKAH, THE FESTIVAL OF INSTITUTION, REPLENISHING, AND RENEWAL

CHAPTER II

HANUKKAH, THE FESTIVAL OF INSTITUTION, REPLENISHING, AND RENEWAL

AN investigation of the festival of Hanukkah must first establish the use of the words, חנך, חנכה (Deut. xx. 5; 1 Kings viii. 63; 2 Chron. vii. 5, 9; Num. vii. 10, 11, 84, 88; Ezra vi. 16, 17; Neh. xii. 27; Prov. xxii. 6; Ps. xxx. title; Dan. iii. 2, 3),[1] and their meaning. With the exception of חנך in Prov. xxii. 6, English and German translations of חנך, חנכה in the O.T., and of their Greek equivalents in 1 M., 2 M., and in N.T. (cf. 1 M. iv. 36, ἐνκαινίσαι; iv. 56, τὸν ἐγκαινισμόν; cf. 2 M. ii. 9; St. John x. 22, τὰ ἐνκαίνια; Heb. ix. 18, ἐνκεκαίνισται; Heb. xvi. 20, ἐνεκαίνισεν), give the renderings, "dedicate," "dedication," "rededicate" (1 M. iv. 36 in Charles, *Apoc.*, vol. i.), "consecrated" (A.V., Heb. x. 20), "feast of the dedication"; "weihen," "einweihen" (cf. Kautzsch, 1 and 2 M., *Apok.*, vol. i.), "Tempelweihe, Tempelweihfest" (cf. Weizäcker, *Das Neue Test.*, St. John x. 22). The Vulgate, with the exception of Prov. xxii. 6, translates the terms in the O.T. by forms of "dedicare" and "dedicatio." In the New Testament there is variation—" dedicatum," in Heb. ix. 18, " initiavit," in Heb. x. 20; while in St. John x. 22, " Encaenia " transliterates the Greek.

---

[1] LXX, B. Deut. xx. 5, ἐνεκαίνισεν (so 1 Kings viii. 63; 2 Chron. vii. 5); 2 Chron. vii. 9, ἐνκαινισμὸν τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου (so Num. vii. 10, 11, 84); Num. vii. 88, ἐγκαίνωσις; Ezra vi. 17 (LXX vii. 7), ἐγκαινισμὸν τοῦ ἱεροῦ; Neh. xii. 27, ἐν ἐγκαινίοις τείχους . . . ποιῆσαι ἐγκαίνια; Prov. xxii. 6, LXX omits; Ps. xxx., τοῦ ἐγκαινισμοῦ τοῦ οἴκου; Dan. iii. 2, Theod., ἐλθεῖν εἰς τὰ ἐνκαίνια τῆς εἰκόνος; iii. 3, εἰς τὸν ἐνκαινισμὸν τῆς εἰκόνος.

Although it has been recognized that the root meaning of the Hebrew חנך is to " initiate," to " begin," and that Hanukkah as translated by *τὰ ἐνκαίνια* (" welches eigentlich Erneuerungsfest bedeutet," art. on " Kirchweihfest," by Dillmann in *Schenkels Bibel-Lexikon*, Bd. iii.) means festival of renewal, the festival and the action of the verb have not been able to free themselves from the conception " dedicate," or even from " consecrate," as modern translations show.[1] The older commentators also exhibit the same halting between the two interpretations, " dedicate " and " initiate." Lund (*Mishnah*, Surenh. to Taʿanith, ii. 10) simply renders בחנכה " in festo initiationis," and adds, " festi huius nomen originem suam verbo חנך debet, quod est ' initiavit,' ut sit hoc festum quasi instaurationis exercitii sacrorum . . . memoria." [2] On the other hand, Houting (*ibid.*, Rosh-hashanah i. 3) gives both meanings, " initiare," " dedicare," for חנך, explains " dedicatio " (חנכה) by " quando aliquid e censu rerum prophanorum aut vulgarium eximitur," and while admitting that strictly the Greek *ἐγκαινίζω* and *ἐγκαινισμός*, which render the Hebrew verb and its noun, signify " renovo," " renovatio," he would translate the Greek also, on the authority of Stephanus (*Thesaurus Græcæ Linguæ*), by "dedico," "dedicatio." Examination, however, of the O.T. passages in which חנך, חנכה appear, and of their Greek equivalents in N.T., 1 and 2 M., makes it clear that חנך is not the same as to "dedicate," and that even when in certain circumstances there is an act of consecration or sanctification at an Hanukkah, the Hanukkah is not that act. Stephan's witness to *ἐνκαινίζω*, as signifying "dedico," in this case would appear to be parallel with his rendering of *προφητεύω* by "prædico futura, vaticinor," and of *προθήτης* by "qui prædicit futura." But *vaticinari*, as Erich Fascher shows, cannot be equated with *προφητεύειν*, but is the Greek *θεσπίζειν*, even as also *vates* is the Greek *μάντις*. For *προφήτης* and *προφητεύω* there is no corresponding Latin expression.[1] That "dedication" is an inaccurate translation of *τὰ ἐνκαίνια* may perhaps be seen in the tendency to transliterate the term into Latin. The Synod of Antioch called "*ἐν ἐγκαινίοις*," 341 A.D., was known as "in encæniis" (cf. Hefele, *History of the Councils*, *re* Athanasius' letter on Council of Rimini, sect. 22).

---

[1] Cf. combination of the two ideas " begin " and " dedicate," by Kittel (*Hellenistische Mysterienreligion und das A.T.*, p. 19): " Denn Weihe, Chanukka bedeutet doch für sich selbst nichts anders als den neuen Anfang, den Neubeginn." Also Riehm, *Handwörterbuch des biblischen Altertums*, art. " Einweihung ": " Auf die Heiligung des Altars durch die Salbung folgte dann zu seiner ' Einweihung ' (Chanukkah) d.h. zu seinem feierlichen erstmaligen Gebrauch ein zwölftägiges Opferfest," usw. (Num. vii.).

[2] Surenhus, Moed Katan iii. 9, " in initiatione templi " ; Meg. iii. 6, " in initiatione templi " ; Meg. iii. 4, " in dedicatione templi." Bikk. i. 6, " עד ח״ usque ad initiationem templi."

In addition to the fact that חנך in 1 Kings viii.; 2 Chron. vii.; Num. vii., and *ἐνκαινίζω* in 1 and 2 M., have special association with the temple-cultus, and connexion with actions of consecrating, anointing, sanctifying, and cleansing, there are two reasons for their having received the interpretation "dedicate." Firstly, the Vulgate's translation of the חנך of the O.T. by "dedicare" must have contributed to the currency of חנכה signifying dedication. But the Vulgate's rendering itself has to be explained by the tradition of the conceptions and practice of the ancient Roman cult. "In order that an edifice destined for the service of the Gods might be erected in due form, the ground was usually, in the first place, *liberatus et effatus* by an Augur, and thus it became a templum; it was then consecrated by a Pontifex, and thus it became a *fanum*; finally, after the building was erected a third ceremony, termed *Dedicatio*, took place by which it was made over to a particular God" (Ramsay, *Manual of Roman Antiquities*, p. 325). It is into this scheme that חנך and *ἐνκαινίζω* have been pressed, and on this pattern we must assume their interpretation as "dedicate" passed over into Latin Christianity. For neither of the two senses which are given to "dedication," the removal or taking out from the realm of the profane or common (Houting), nor the handing over to a particular God of a sanctuary (Ramsay) or of a sacred object, represents the content of the Hebrew and Greek verbs. This we must now seek to show.

---

[1] Προφήτης, *Eine sprach- und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung*, von E. Fascher, 1927, pp. 2–6.

In the oldest passage in the O.T. that has direct bearing upon our subject, Deut. xx. 5 f., the action of the verb חנך is applied to a private dwelling-house. When the troops are mustering for warfare, the officers dismiss certain of the people to their homes under particular conditions. Proclamation is made (A.V.): "What man is there that hath built a new house and has not dedicated it (ולא חנכו)? Let him go and return to his house, lest he die in the battle, and another man dedicate it (ואיש אחר יחנכנו). And what man is he that has planted a vineyard and has not yet (ולא חללו) eaten of it? Let him go also and return unto his house, lest he die in the battle, and another man eat of it. And what man is there that hath betrothed a wife and hath not taken her? Let him go and return unto his house, lest he die in the battle and another man take her." Three cases of temporary exemption are here placed before us. All of them are analogous. The common element in them all is an opportunity to "initiate" or "put" to use. The man who up till now has only reaped the firstfruits of the vines which he could not put to his own use as these were sacred, received exemption that he might "profane" (ver. 6 חללו) the vineyard, that is, make it common or secular, that he might use the fruits for his own purposes. The man who had betrothed a woman was now granted (cf. xxiv. 5) a year's release from the duties of war, and was allowed to proceed to the taking (ver. 7 לקחה) of her, lest if he died in battle, another might "take her." The enjoying of the vineyard and of the reality of married life are placed upon the same plane of thought—the initiation to use. And when we revert to the first class of persons exempted, "the man who has built a new house" (איש בנה בית חדש ולא חנכו), we must interpret ולא חנכו, "and has not commenced the use of it, or put it in a state of use." The context of the passage points to the Hanukkah of the private house as being the initiation to use and possession, and this is supported by Codex Ambrosianus (F), which offers for the *μὴ . . . ἕτερος ἐνκαινιεῖ αὐτήν* of LXX B, *μὴ . . . ἕτερος κληρονομήσει αὐτόν*. The action of חנך in this case is not that of removing from the realm of the profane and common to that of the sacred, but the putting to common use.

Though the Hanukkah of a private house does not imply dedication but rather the opposite, we may not suppose that the founding of the household in a newly built house was entirely without religious significance or ceremony. Riehm (*Einweihung in Handwörterbuch des bibl. Alt.*) thinks that in the age for which Deut. xx. 5 prescribes, the Hanukkah of the new house consisted perhaps only in celebrating entrance by a banquet.[1] Even if this were so, it is certain that originally the occupation of a new house was signalized by more than the giving of a banquet. According to Curtiss (*Primitive Semitic Religion*, p. 196; see Thomson, *Semitic Magic, its Origins and Development*, p. 228), the primitive religious theory in Syria to-day is that "every house must have its death, a man, woman, child, or an animal. God has appointed a fedou (atonement or redemption) for every building through sacrifice." When a house is finished, a sacrifice on the doorstep is made for the building. This threshold-sacrifice is called "presenting a kaffârah" (Curtiss, *Bibl. World*, xxi. 254), and the reason for it, as given to Curtiss by the Shekh of Kafr Harib (above the Sea of Galilee), was—a victim is slain "because every place, land, or spot on the earth has its own dwellers, lest one of the family die in this land. Because it is not theirs, they redeem the family by a fedou" (*ib.*, p. 253).

In this light must be regarded the foundation- and building-sacrifices (1 Kings xvi. 34) which in ancient Israel persisted down to the time of the Kings. They were made as satisfaction to the "Lord of the place."[2] If, therefore, the Hanukkah of the ordinary dwelling is brought within the circle of religious conceptions and practices, these reveal themselves to have attached to the ideas of atonement and redemption (fedou, kaffârah, כפר), which signify not the dedication or handing over to a God, but rather the reconciliation of, or purchasing from a God, before the dwelling could be put to secular use.

---

[1] "Die in 5 Mose xx. 5 erwähnte Einweihung neugebauter Privathäuser ist wohl nur von dem vielleicht mit einem Gastmahl gefeierten Bezug derselben zu verstehen; erst eine spätere Tradition hat daraus besondere Einweihungsfeierlichkeiten gemacht, deren Kern die mit Segens- und Lobsprüchen verbundene Anhaftung derselben Gesetzesstellen, welche auch auf den Denkzetteln standen, über den Oberschwellen und an der rechten Seite der Eingangstüren war."

[2] Cf. Gressmann, *Texte und Bilder*, Bd. ii. p. 51 f. Abb. 85, 86, 87; *Die älteste Geschichtsschreibung und Prophetie Israels* (to 1 Kings xvi. 34), 1910, p. 256. Later, "Man begnügte sich gewöhnlich mit einem symbolischen Opfer." Present-day practice in Palestine of letting blood run on the threshold of the house as "Bauopfer" (Gressmann, *Der Erdgeruch Palästinas in der Isr. Rel.*, p. 27 f.).

We must now turn to 1 Kings viii. 62 f. and to 2 Chron. vii. 5–9, which is in verbal agreement with and literary dependence on 1 Kings viii. 62 f. Here חנך and חנכה are brought into relation with the building of the temple, and have therefore a very definite religious setting. With these passages we also may associate Num. vii. 1 f., belonging to the Priestly Code, because in the event here described, the erection of the tabernacle by Moses, "P," in picturing the Mosaic past which lay beyond ken and memory, has the temple in view, and that ceremony in which Solomon was the chief actor. An act of dedication or of consecration we expect to precede the use of any religious building or object. But in 1 Kings viii. 62, 63a the offering of sacrifices of various sorts takes place at once without any such act of dedication being mentioned, unless it be contained in the intention of the preceding prayer of supplication. The Hanukkah of the House (ויחנכו את־בית יהוה, ver. 63b) is mentioned after these sacrifices, appearing as either an act of completion or, from another point of view, as act of initiation, and as having been made by the King and all the children of Israel. It is no priestly action. In verse 64 an act of consecration *is* performed by Solomon. Because the brazen altar was not large enough for all the sacrifices being burned thereon, the middle of the court in front of the temple had to be set apart for the purpose. But this setting apart or sanctifying is expressed by קדש (LXX, *ἡγίασεν ὁ βασιλεὺς κ.τ.λ.*). In the account of the Chronicler (2 Chron. vii. 5–9) we note the same sequence of events, the same differentiation between ויחנכו (ver. 5), as act of the King and all the people, and ויקדש (ver. 7), the act of consecration on the part of the King; only, from 2 Chron. vii. 1 f., it is even more evident that use of the altar preceded both what is described as the Hanukkah of the House (ver. 5) and the Hanukkah of the altar (ver. 9).

In Hebrew practice it is clear (cf. Jud. xvii. 3; 2 Sam. viii. 11; 2 Kings xii. 19; 1 Chron. xviii. 11, xxvi. 26 f.)[1] there is no distinction made between dedication and consecration. In the setting apart of vessels, altar of incense, and altar of burnt-offering, we might speak more appropriately of their being "dedicated" to a sacred purpose. But the anointing of these sacred fittings and utensils (Ex. xxx. 26 f.) which is described by "P," Kautzsch (*H.B.D.*, extra vol., "Religion of Israel," p. 60) observes "is plainly an act of consecration," משח (anoint) and קדש (consecrate) being used both of things and persons (cf. Lev. viii. 10 f.). If, then, 1 Kings viii. 62 f., 2 Chron. vii. 5 f., distinguish between חנך and קדש, we cannot any longer speak of Hanukkah as meaning either dedication or consecration.

The content of the idea of Hanukkah receives further illumination from Num. vii. 1 f., the passage from the Law, read in the synagogues on the festival. The tabernacle has just been set up by Moses. As might be expected from "P," the notion of dedication is expressed in very positive manner, and comprehends not only the tabernacle itself, but all the vessels. The words employed to denote this, however, are verse 1, וימשח and ויקדש (LXX, *ἔχρισεν αὐτὴν καὶ ἡγίασεν*), "and he (Moses) anointed and sanctified." After this act of dedication, the writer describes how the twelve princes of Israel bring their gifts (ver. 10, קרבנם; LXX, *τὰ δῶρα αὐτῶν*) "for the Hanukkah of the altar" (LXX, *εἰς τὸν ἐγκαινισμὸν τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου*) on twelve successive days. These offerings are noteworthy. Besides animals for sacrifice, there are various utensils for the service of the sanctuary. By the verbatim repetition of five verses twelve times, recounting these offerings, the author's aim is not merely "to dilate upon the example of liberality displayed" (Driver, *Introd. to Lit. of O.T.*, p. 57), but himself displays his particular joy in the endowment of the holy place. These gifts were for the Hanukkah of the tabernacle and of the altar, for the plenishing of them, for starting them upon their course of beneficial service. The words of the LXX, verse 5, express this thus, *καὶ ἔσονται πρὸς τὰ ἔργα τὰ λειτουργικά* (והיו לעבד את עבדת אהל, "and they shall be for the service of the tent"). "For the Hanukkah" of the tabernacle and altar, and "for the service" of the tabernacle, are seen to be identical in content.[1] That this instituting and plenishing was an act or a series of acts following after, and distinct from, dedication is manifest from verse 88 when, after the enumeration of the offerings, it is stated—"this was the Hanukkah of the altar *after* it was anointed" (אחרי המשח אתו). The thought of instituting by replenishing will be seen to receive additional light upon it from 1 and 2 M. "Initiating" and "instituting" remain passive and colourless conceptions till it is understood that they imply plenishing and endowing, or, in certain circumstances, replenishing, renewing, restoring to service.

---

[1] Dedication (consecration) of things, silver, etc., expressed by Hiph. of קדש.

The description of the Hanukkah of the temple after the Exile (Ezra vi. 15 f.) is limited, but the features we have already observed as distinctive of a

---

[1] Cf. LXX, verse 10, *προσήνεγκαν . . . εἰς τὸν ἐγκαινισμόν*; cf. verse 11, *προσοίσουσιν τὰ δῶρα αὐτῶν εἰς τὸν ἐγκαινισμόν*.

Hanukkah are present. There is no mention of any act of consecration. Offerings of animals for the Hanukkah are brought in great number (ver. 17) (והקריבו לחנכת בית אלהא ; LXX, *καὶ προσήνεγκαν εἰς τὸν ἐγκαινισμὸν τοῦ ἱεροῦ*). We may also include in the Hanukkah-gifts the vessels restored by Darius (ver. 5), and the provision he made (ver. 9) for burnt-offerings. The celebration is on account of the renewal and restoration of the temple-worship. The priests and the Levites are anew set in their divisions and stations (ver. 18) for the continuous conduct of the service. And the Hanukkah does not even seem to be completed (ver. 19) until the following month of Nisan, when the Passover could be celebrated. When the festival element of worship was added, then the cultus could be said to be established and restored. The Hanukkah in the days of Solomon had likewise found completion in the festival of Booths (1 Kings viii. 65). This tradition was probably not only the pattern for this trait in the *narrative* of Ezra vi. 15 f., but for the actual procedure.

The account (Neh. xii. 27 f.) of the Hanukkah of the wall of Jerusalem, and the story of the Hanukkah of the new image which Nebuchadnezzar had made (Dan. iii. 1–3), to the worship of which Daniel's three friends are summoned, accord with the preceding analysis of חנך and חנכה. They justify our speaking of the celebration of the "restoration" of the wall and of the "institution" of the worship of the new image.[1] In the first instance (Neh. xii. 30) the gates and the wall are cleansed (ויטהרו), but so are the priests, Levites, and the people. The

---

[1] *ἐνκαινισμόν* (of Dan. iii. 3) is not the word used for the consecration of an image, but *ἵδρυσις*; cf. T. Zielinski, *The Religion of Ancient Greece*, 1926, p. 79: "A statue becomes an object of worship only at the moment of consecration (hidrysis)."

Chronicler's addition (ver. 43) also mentions that great sacrifices were offered. But in so far as the Hanukkah of the wall was not merely celebration by rejoicings (cf. LXX, ver. 27, *ποιῆσαι ἐνκαίνια καὶ εὐφροσύνην*), the cultic ceremonies connected with it are rather to be regarded as effecting freedom from the influence of evil demons,[1] or as securing atonement, as in the case of a Hanukkah of a new house. The wall is not placed thereby in the realm of things sacred.

If חנך ever had meant "dedicate" or "consecrate" in the simplest or widest conception of these terms, we might expect it to be applied to the Nazirite, who was a dedicated or consecrated person. But חנך and its Greek equivalent are never so employed. The Nazirite's consecration (נזר, Num. vi. 7) is of God "upon his head"; he is "holy unto Jahveh" (Num. vi. 8, קדש ליהוה), and after defilement his consecration can be renewed by atoning sacrifice, and thereupon he has again "consecrated his head" (cf. Num. vi. 11, וקדש את־ראשו).[2] The reason for this different language, expressive of being set apart or dedicated, is not that חנך is limited in its reference merely to sacred objects. The word is as capable of reference to persons as to things, as Prov. xxii. 6 (A.V. "Train up a child in the way he should go," חנך לנער על־פי דרכו) shows.[3] The verb here has the significance of "give a first start," "begin," "initiate," the sense which, in all other places where it appears, it retains. The passage has peculiar interest because of its treatment at the hands of the Vulgate, which everywhere else in the O.T. translates חנך by "dedicare," but now renders, "*proverbium est*: adulescens juxta viam suam." The theory that חנך meant "dedicare" obviously met with a difficulty which had to be overcome by avoidance.

---

[1] Cf. Max Haller, *Das Judentum. Schr. des Alt. Test.*, 1914, p. 154: "Zeremonien, die sie dem Einfluss böser Dämonen entziehen sollten."

[2] LXX, Num. vi. 11, *ἁγιάσει*; vi. 13, 21, a N. is *εὐξαμένου*; cf. Amos ii. 12, *ἡγιασμένους*. Cf. *H.B.D.* "Nazirite."

[3] Cf. Talmud, Naz. 29a, כדי לחנכו במצות, to initiate a (son) in the performance of religious duties. חניך is "educator" or father who rears up a child. M. Kat. 25b, חניכה is the rubbing of an infant's palate with a chewed fig (when he received his name), *ibid.*; cf. Jastrow, *Talmud Dictionary*.

Before passing to the description given by 1 and 2 M. of the Hanukkah of the temple in the time of Judas and to the question of what that Hanukkah implied, we must examine two passages in the N.T. in which both translators and commentators employ the word "dedication" (Heb. ix. 18, x. 20). The writer of the epistle (R.V. ix. 16, 17) states that "where a testament is, there must of necessity be the death of him that made it. . . . For a testament is of force where there has been death; for doth it ever avail while he that made it liveth?" Then he adds (ix. 18), "Wherefore even the first (covenant) hath not been dedicated without blood" (*ὅθεν οὐδὲ ἡ πρώτη χωρὶς αἵματος ἐνκεκαίνισται*).[1] This argument is further supported by the statement that Moses sprinkled with blood "both the book itself, and all the people, saying, This is the blood of the covenant" (vers. 19, 20). The translation of the word *διαθήκη* in verses 16, 17 by "testament," and then in the next verses by "covenant," has met with general acceptance. Peake, in defence of it, notes a double meaning in *διαθήκη* as both a "will" and a "covenant," and, in verse 18, a passing over from the former sense of the word to the latter.[2] "It is clear," he says, "that there is no logical connexion between the death which brings a will into force and the death which was needed to dedicate a covenant." The ambiguity of the word *διαθήκη*, he asserts, covered for the author the logical hiatus, and also the inconvenient fact that, as the O.T. recognizes (cf. 1 Sam. xviii. 3), a covenant might be made without death. On the answer to the question whether διαθήκη in Heb. ix. 16 f. means will—testament—throughout (A.V.), or covenant throughout (Moulton, Milligan), or passes from the first meaning to the second, the sense of the word ἐνκεκαίνισται may seem in some degree to depend. If διαθήκη in verses 9, 18, means will or testament, it is evident that the writer of Hebrews cannot speak of a will being dedicated. Professor Deissmann (*Licht vom Osten*, 1909, p. 253) says, with regard to the signification of διαθήκη as witnessed to by the inscriptions and papyri: "I can assert, on the testimony of extensive material, that no man in the first century A.D. in the countries that border the Mediterranean, would alight upon the thought of finding in the word διαθήκη the notion of covenant (Bund). Even Paul could not have done so, and did not do so; the word means to him, as already to his Greek Old Testament, a non-reciprocal disposition (*einseitige Verfügung*), in particular, a testament." Assuming, however, that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews draws his line of thought beyond the ambit of the use of διαθήκη as found in the papyri of his time, or that a double meaning of the word did exist, then the logical hiatus which Peake observes becomes unnecessarily wide if ἐνκεκαίνισται means dedicated. A will comes into force and practice when its provisions and arrangements are instituted, but is not dedicated or consecrated. If a will could be regarded as dedicated through the person, who made it, dying, and if this were the author's thought, then we have again to borrow from the supposition of another transferred meaning. Also while the death of a testator precedes the coming into force of his will, a covenant ordinarily takes effect in the lifetime of those who enter into it. A writer or speaker may vary by *nuances* and different significance one or two terms in a comparison, but he may not change them all. But if the writer of Hebrews has extended the use of διαθήκη from the sense in which he has previously used it, so as to include the meaning of covenant, his reasoning does not gain by, nor require the interpretation of, ἐνκεκαίνισται as "dedicated." He argues that a testamentary disposition comes into force and action (βεβαία . . . ἰσχύει) when the testator dies, and thus we may see the reason for the death (the blood) of Christ; even the first διαθήκη (covenant) of God with Israel was not instituted (ἐνκεκαίνισται) and operative without the shedding of blood, since Moses at that time sprinkled the people with blood; even in this case, where of course the death of the Maker of the covenant does not enter into the thought as a possibility, there were the blood marks (οὐδὲ . . . χωρὶς αἵματος). This is all the writer here desires to say. The thought of dedication and consecration is in the passage, in the "sanctify" (ἁγιάζει) of verse 13, within the "sprinkled" (ἐράντισεν) of verse 19, but associated, in fact, as these actions are, with ἐνκεκαίνισται "made operative" of verse 18, the separation is complete in idea and content, the parallels of the latter being "established" (βεβαία) and "come into force" (ἰσχύει) of verse 17. So in Heb. x. 20 we cannot speak with R.V. of Jesus having "dedicated" for us the entrance into the sanctuary through the veil of His flesh. What Jesus has done is by His death to open up, "institute," and bring into the realm of actuality "a new and living way" (εἴσοδον . . . ἣν ἐνεκαίνισεν). So far as "dedication" is concerned it is we who have been dedicated to enter upon that way, "having had our hearts sprinkled (*ῥεραντισμένοι*) from an evil conscience, and our body washed with pure water" (ver. 22).

---

[1] Cf. Georg Hollmann (*Schr. d. N.T. neu übersetzt*, usw.), *ad loc.*: "Daher ist auch die erste Bundstiftung nicht ohne Blut eingeweiht."

[2] *Century Bible*, "Hebrews," p. 188.

1 and 2 M. establish the significance of *ἐνκαινισμός* as "institution," "setting to service," and also permit us to invest this general concept with the particular elements it possessed in the Hanukkah of the temple which was the historical occasion of the arising of the Jewish festival.

A very clear light is shed by 2 M. ii. 29 on what must be understood by *ἐνκαινίζειν*. The Epitomist is preparing his readers for the method he purposes to take in summarizing the five books of Jason. He will make Jason, the original historian, responsible for the narrative of the events in their entirety and for the details. Jason he compares to the master builder of a new house whose business it has been to see to the entire structure. His own task, he tells us, is *ἐνκαινίζέιν καὶ ζωγραφεῖν*, and to perform *τὰ επιτήδεια πρὸς διακόσμησιν*. The first word *ἐνκαινίζειν* we must here translate as "complete" or "furnish"; *ζωγραφεῖν* as "decorate," "paint," or "beautify"; and *τὰ ἐπιτήδεια κ.τ.λ.* as "those things serviceable for setting (the house) in order."[1] The Epitomist does not think of himself as one who has merely decorated a house and left it empty, but rather as one who has prepared therein "a banquet" (ver. 27) for his guests. The word under special consideration has at least the significance of "introducing" something new.

In the Paris Papyri, 16.24 (127 B.C.), as restored (Moulton and Milligan, *Voc. of Greek Test., etc.*, under *ἐνκαινίζω*), we meet with the injunction,

---

[1] Moffatt (Charles, *Apoc.*, vol. i.) translates *ἐγκαινίζειν* "inlay"; Kamphausen (Kautzsch, *Apok.*, Bd. i.), *ἐνκαιν. καὶ ζωγρ.*, "Zeichnen und malen."

κα[τα]κολουθεῖν τοῖς ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐθισμοῖς καὶ μη[θὲν ἐνκαινί]ζειν, "to follow the customs as they were from the beginning, and to make no innovation"—to introduce nothing new. Dr. Milligan observes that "if we can trust the restoration . . . this verb can no longer be regarded as exclusively Biblical and ecclesiastical" (cf. Grimm Thayer). But 2 M. ii. 29 is already sufficient proof of the word not having this limitation, and the preconception that it has must be relegated to the number of similar preconceptions which the papyri have destroyed. On the principle that *ἐγκαινίζειν* and its noun, when they appear in connexion with sacral acts, must betoken dedication, Kautzsch translates 1 M. iv. 56, *καὶ ἐποίησαν τὸν ἐγκαινισμὸν τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου*, as intending "they celebrated the dedication (consecration) of the altar," but in the next sentence (ver. 57), *καὶ ἐνεκαίνισαν τὰς πύλας κ.τ.λ.*, as "they restored the gates."[1] Oesterley (1 M. in Charles, *Apoc.*) regards this latter act as sacral, and holds to "dedicated afresh the gates." But the truth is, that even when the reference of חנך and *ἐνκαινίζειν* is to sacred buildings, these terms do not mean dedicate or consecrate. That the words are so often found in a religious context is due to the occasions of national restoration having a religious character, to every signal event being something new, and to every new event, be it the moving to a new house, the building anew of the city wall, or the giving a child his name (cf. note 3, p. 37), being bound up with religious ritual. But this does not constitute the meaning of חנך and its Greek equivalent as "dedicate." A comparison of 2 M. ii. 29 with 1 M. iv. 57 reveals a most striking similarity in both thought and language,[1] which should cause us to pause before we give to ἐνκαινίζειν in the latter passage an "exclusively" ecclesiastical significance on the ground merely that here the reference is to the House of God, while in 2 M. ii. 29 it is to an ordinary house. To regard ἐνκαινίζειν in sacred associations as having in some degree an "exclusive" meaning is justified, but this does not justify our choosing the wrong "exclusive" meaning.

---

[1] Kautzsch, *Apok.*, Bd. i. p. 45: "Und sie feierten die Einweihung des Altars"—1 M. iv. 56; "stellten die Thore (und Zellen) wieder her"—1 M. iv. 57.

We hear of ἐγκαίνια in the Early Church in the East. Eusebius (*Hist.*, bk. x. cap. iii.) mentions "festivals of enkainia and consecrations (ἀφιερώσεις) of newly erected houses of prayer," thus clearly distinguishing between the consecration of certain new sacred buildings and the ἐνκαινισμός of other churches which these enkainia-festivals celebrated. It would appear, since he is describing the end of the period of the persecution of Christianity with the coming of Constantine to power, that these enkainia celebrate in the first instance the restoration of the Christian churches to their owners, the repairing and refurnishing for their purpose, and in the second place the return of the revenue and property that had been confiscated, not to mention possible additional endowments and provision which the Emperor made.[2] The festivals referred to are apparently festivals of reinstitution, and in that case the churches were such as had already been consecrated. Athanasius also makes the same distinction. He speaks of the ἀφιερώσις of the Church of the "Great Martyr," built on the Place of the Skull in Jerusalem, and consecrated on 13th December, A.D. 335 (letter on Councils of Rimini and Seleucia, sect. 21), while in the case of the great Church called "Cæsarean" at Alexandria, *Apology to Constantius*, sect. 18 (24), it is a question of the enkainia-festival, and mention is made of the people offering for the "enkainismos" when all the work of building was completed.[1] These offerings were obviously for the upkeep of the Church, its organization, use, and charities, and if they were of a kind that could be blessed or consecrated or dedicated by being placed upon the Lord's table (cf. Harnack, *Mission und Ausbreitung d. Chr.*, 3rd ed. Bd. i. p. 164), or by prayer, the idea would find expression in ἁγιάζειν (cf. Matt. xxiii. 17, 19; cf. 2 Tim. ii. 21, σκεῦος . . . ἡγιασμένον), and not in ἐνκαινίζειν. The gifts *after* dedication were for the further purpose of the enkainismos.[2] As enkainismos of an altar or sanctuary is not dedication, neither can it be rededication,[3] for in 1 Kings viii. the temple and the altar are new, and in Dan. iii. the enkainia are in connexion with the worship of the new image. The term "inaugurate," on the other hand, though in its modern connotation corresponding to ἐνκαινίζειν (cf. LXX, 1 Sam. xi. 14 = חדש), arises out of the cultus,[4] while ἐνκαινίζειν does not, and when the latter word is applied to the cultus, it has definite implications which "inaugurate" tends to conceal.

---

[1] Cf. 1 M. iv. 57: *καὶ κατεκόσμησαν τὸ κατὰ πρόσωπον τοῦ ναοῦ στεφάνοις χρυσοῖς καὶ ἀσπιδίσκαις, καὶ ἐνεκαίνισαν τὰς πύλας καὶ τὰ παστοφόρια καὶ ἐθύρωσαν αὐτά.* Cf. 2 M. ii. 29, *διακόσμησιν*, etc.

[2] Cf. Edict of Milan, Eusebius, *Hist.*, bk. x. cap. v.; bk. x. cap. vii.; *de vit. Const.* ii. 39 f.

Passing from the general sense of ἐνκαινίζειν as initiate, institute, put to service, introduce, furnish, we must now analyse the concept, as applied in 1 and 2 M., to the Hanukkah of the temple.

---

[1] προσήνεγκαν εἰς τὸν ἐγκαινισμὸν καὶ πάντες ἑώρτασαν ἐπὶ τῇ τελεσιουργίᾳ (Athan. *Apology*, sect. 18 (24); cf. Ezra vi. 17, LXX).

[2] Cf. Num. vii. 88: "This was the Hanukkah of the altar *after* it was anointed" (consecrated).

[3] If by rededication (cf. 1 M. iv. 36–61, Charles, *Apoc.*) is meant "reconsecration" (cf. *ibid.* 2 M. ii. 10), it has also ecclesiastical practice and sentiment against it. Cf. Eadie (*Ecclesiastical Encycl.*, p. 117, referring to the law of England): "A church once consecrated may not be consecrated again."

[4] "Inauguratio" (Ramsay, *Manual of Roman Antiquities*, pp. 323–329,337).

1. The festival of Hanukkah is one commemorative of the institution and completion of the temple (ἐγκαινισμοῦ καὶ τῆς τελειώσεως τοῦ ἱεροῦ, 2 M. ix.). The immediate reference is to the temple of Solomon and its institution, which to the Epitomist is a pattern provided by the past for the Hanukkah of the House in the Maccabean period. In the latter period we must speak of the *reinstitution* and *restoration* of the sanctuary and its service. In 1 M. v. 1, "the nations round about heard that the altar had been built and the sanctuary restored as at first" (ὅτι ᾠκοδομήθη τὸ θυσιαστήριον καὶ ἐνεκαινίσθη τὸ ἁγίασμα ὡς τὸ πρότερον). Here ἐνεκαινίσθη does not seem to have any wider significance than ἀνεκαίνισεν in LXX, 2 Chron. xv. 8 [where ויחדש is Heb.], as meaning the restoration of an altar which had fallen into disuse. The letter of Athanasius (*ut sup.*) to Constantius, making excuse to the Emperor for the use by the people of the church at Alexandria before the church building had actually been completed, makes it clear that it was the thought of completion, rather than any sacral act consequent on completion, which was the chief inspiration and idea of enkainia-rejoicings, and these it was feared had been compromised by a too-previous use. The same thought of the enkainia as completion-rejoicings is placed prominently before us by the homilies on Hanukkah in the Midrash of Rab Kahana, which start from the text (Num vii. 1), "When Moses had completed" (ויהי ביום כלות משה).

2. The reinstitution of the temple and its service required the cleansing of the sanctuary. In 2 M. ii. 16 the festival commemorates simply "the cleansing." "Intending therefore to celebrate 'the

cleansing' (*τὸν καθαρισμόν*) we have written to you" reveals the purpose of the prooemium and of the book as Hanukkah-tractate. It is God Himself who "cleansed the Place" (2 M. ii. 18). The Epitomist sets himself the task of narrating "the things concerning Judas Maccabæus and his brothers, and the cleansing of the great temple and the enkainismos of the altar." The "cleansing" (2 M. x. 5) of the sanctuary took place on the same day of the month on which it had been desecrated. After "cleansing the sanctuary" (2 M. x. 3) they made another altar, and offered hymns of praise to Him who "had prospered the cleansing of His own Place." When Nikanor threatens to convert the temple into a temple of Dionysos, the priests beseech the Lord to preserve undefiled their "house so lately cleansed" (2 M. xiv. 36). How important this aspect of the enkainismos of the temple and altar is in the eyes of the Epitomist is shown by the story of the oil, which, when the sun was risen, produced the sacred fire for the burning of the wood and sacrifice upon the altar. This naphtha (*nephthar*, *nephthai*) is by interpretation, the author tells us, "cleansing" (*καθαρισμός*, 2 M. i. 36; cf. i. 18). In 1 M. we do not have the same emphasis on cleansing which meets us so often in 2 M., as an element of the Hanukkah of the House, but 1 M. iv. 36 reports that Judas and his brothers encourage their followers to go up "to cleanse the Holy Place and restore it." The garrison in the akra is held in check while the cleansing is in process (1 M. iv. 41 f.). The *καθαρισμὸς τοῦ ἱεροῦ* is a preparatory stage of that which is described as enkainismos. The ritual purification of the shrine has first to be undertaken, and all traces of foreign worship, of the cult of Zeus Olympios (2 M. vi. 2), obliterated. The altar of Zeus, the "abomination" (*βδέλυγμα*) built on the old large altar of burnt-offering, was removed, and its fragments put in an unclean place, and even the huge stones of the large altar itself were set elsewhere aside (1 M. vi. 7, iv. 44 f., i. 54). The purpose of the cleansing is to secure atonement, to effect reconciliation of the deity with the place and to make reparation to the deity offended—"to present a 'kaffârah.'" The ordinances which Ezekiel (xliii. 18 f.) prescribes for the cleansing of the altar before it could be used for public sacrifice (ver. 27), his instructions for the half-yearly unsinning (חטא) of the sanctuary and altar (xlv. 18 f.), give particular prominence to the conceptions of atonement (cf. xliii. 26 יכפרו את; ver. 20; xlv. 20) as being the object of the purification (טהר). Whether Ezekiel's prescriptions were ever adopted in the temple-ritual or not, the stress laid by him upon ritual cleansing and its purpose must, in the days of the restoration of the temple-cultus by Judas, have secured response, and have corresponded to deeply rooted ideas of popular religion. From the necessary importance the cleansing of the temple and altar would have, it has been concluded that the eight days of the Hanukkah-festival originate in no other fact than the requirement of seven days for the purification of the altar.[1] It is very possible that this feature of the Hanukkah of the House did leave its impression on the festival itself.

---

[1] Hamburger, *Real-Encyclo. für Bibel und Talmud*, Weihfest-Chanukkah: "In der Bestimmung von 8 Tagen erkennen wir keine Nachahmung des Laubhüttenfestes sondern die gesetzlich notwendige Zeit von 7 Tagen zur Altarweihe" (cf. Ezek. xliii. 27). The Haṭṭath ritual which secures unsinning, atoning, and cleansing has, according to Stade (*Bib. Theol. d. A.T.*, p. 164 f.), positive (קדש consecrating) as well as negative effect (removal of profane character or of cultic impurity). W. R. Smith (*Rel. Sem.*, 2nd ed. p. 408 f.) also regards this ritual, whereby the blood of the expiatory animal (חטאת) was sprinkled on the sanctuary or altar (Ezek. xlv. 18 f.; Lev. xvi.), as implying a positive element, a periodical reconsecration or refreshing. Dr. Gray, on the other hand, remarks (*Sacrifice in the O.T.*, p. 359, note 1) that "in Ezek. and Lev. the blood is not, as Smith suggests, a tonic, but a disinfectant," and that the negative aim of the ritual

3. From a certain viewpoint the main element in the Hanukkah of the House was the plenishing of it with the sacred vessels and objects of the sanctuary. This looms very prominently in both 1 and 2 M. Antiochus (1 M. i. 21 f.) on his return from the Egyptian campaign had plundered the temple and taken "the golden altar, and the Lamp-stand, and all the utensils belonging to it, and the table of shewbread, and the cups and the bowls and the golden censers." He took "the silver and the gold and the choice vessels" (τὰ σκεύη τὰ ἐπιθυμητά). In 1 M. ii. 8–12, which retains traces in the Greek of having been Hebrew poetry, a poem possibly much older than 1 M. itself, we catch a glimpse of the situation as this must have impressed itself upon those who witnessed the temple's despoiling. The poet's plaint is:

> "Her house is become like that of man dishonoured:
> Her glorious vessels (τὰ σκεύη τῆς δόξης) are carried away captive" (vers. 8, 9).

We see why the reading of Num. vii., with its account of the liberal endowment of the tabernacle with σκεύη, was found most appropriate to celebrate Hanukkah. 1 M. iv. 47 f. gives a picture full of detail of the replenishing of the House by Judas and the priests he had chosen. "They made the holy vessels new (ἐποίησαν τὰ σκεύη τὰ ἅγια καινά), and they brought the Lamp-stand and the altar of burnt-offerings and of incense and the table into the temple." It is still Hanukkah as under the aspect

in Ezek. xlv. 18 f. and Lev. xvi. 19 is clearly indicated. It seems difficult to confine the notions of reconciliation and atonement (Sühne) to purely negative implications (see Stade, *ut sup.*), but the καθαρισμός of the sanctuary, as described by 1 and 2 M., is certainly more of a privative character (the removal of heathen pollution) than otherwise.

of plenishing, when we read (1 M. iv. 57) that "they decked the forefront of the temple . . . and restored the gates and the chambers (of the priests) and furnished them with doors" (*ἐνεκαίνισεν τὰς πύλας καὶ τὰ παστοφόρια καὶ ἐθύρωσαν αὐτά*). Antiochus repents when nigh to death (1 M. vi. 12), that he had taken *πάντα τὰ σκεύη* of silver and gold from the temple in Jerusalem, and (1 M. xiv. 15), in a poem on Simon's deeds and merits, his plenishing of the temple stands out in relief.

> "He glorified the sanctuary,
> He multiplied the vessels of the temple"
> (*ἐπλήθυνεν τὰ σκεύη τῶν ἁγίων*).

In 2 M. we find unabated the same keen interest and concern in the temple appurtenances. The sacrilege (2 M. iv. 39) committed by Lysimachus seems to have been chiefly the selling of a large number of gold vessels. The ambassadors who complain against Menelaos are the spokesmen "for Israel's city, and folk, and sacred vessels" (iv. 48 f.). Antiochus, with "his polluted hands," had taken away "the sacred vessels (*τὰ ἱερὰ σκεύη*) and those things that other kings had offered to the honour of the Place." The author of 2 M. renders a theological reason why Antiochus was not punished as Heliodorus had been, who sought "to pry into the treasury" (v. 18). Antiochus, exhibiting repentance on the approach of death, promises "that he would adorn with magnificent offerings the holy sanctuary which he had formerly rifled, restoring all the sacred vessels many times over, and defraying from his own revenue the expense of the sacrifices" (ix. 16). Judas and his men when they capture the temple (x. 3 f.) introduce without loss of time, after cleansing the sanctuary, the most necessary temple-furniture. In both 1 M. (cf. vi. 1 f.) and 2 M. (cf. ix. 1 f.)

Epiphanes is depicted as the robber of temples, not only of the sanctuary in Jerusalem. The opposite of temple-despoiling, namely, temple-endowing, furnishing, and completing is enkainismos, enkainia.

4. Hanukkah of the House under another aspect is the institution of the temple-service by the renewal of the public sacrifices. Judas built a new altar of burnt-offerings as at the first (1 M. iv. 47 f.). That the sacrifice to Jahveh should have ceased was the greatest catastrophe of all. In Daniel (xi. 31, xii. 11) its cessation is the climax of the persecution.

In the siege of Jerusalem by Titus, in spite of war and famine, the daily morning and evening offering had been made, till at length not even by the pressure of the famine, but by lack of men, the sacrifice had to be abandoned (Jos. *B.J.* vi. 2. 1). The reinstitution of the sacrifice was the central and chief act of the Hanukkah of the House. The relation of the people with Jahveh was restored. It is in this light we must read the account (1 M. iv. 52 f.), "they offered sacrifice according to the Law upon the new altar of burnt-offering which they had made . . . ; on that day it was instituted (ἐνεκαινίσθη) with songs, and harps, and lutes, and with cymbals." "And they celebrated the institution (ἐγκαινισμόν) of the altar eight days" (ver. 56 ; cf. ver. 59). The Epitomist, in his prooemium giving the O.T. models of the Hanukkah of the temple, mentions the sacrifice of institution (θυσίαν ἐγκαινισμοῦ, 2 M. ii. 9) in Solomon's time. The legend of Nehemiah and the naphtha manifests the Epitomist's desire to show that the altar was put to service on another former occasion in a miraculous way, and the initial sacrifice consumed by sacred fire (2 M. i. 22 f.). This thought (cf. 2 Chron. vii. 1 f.), so dear to the Epitomist, makes contact with the account (2 M. x. 1 f.) belonging apparently to Jason's history, whereby the institution of the altar-sacrifice is secured by striking fire out of flints. This is the enkainismos of the altar (2 M. ii. 19).

Though not belonging strictly to the חנכת הבית, yet intimately connected with it, as 1 and 2 M. show, are three other factors comprehended in the term "Hanukkah."

(*a*) *The Building of the Walls of the Temple-mount.*—After the ordinance of an annual festival, 1 M. iv. 60 narrates, "at that season they built high walls and strong towers round about Mount Sion." Antiochus hears (1 M. vi. 7) of the restoration of the Jewish cultus, and that the Jews "had surrounded the sanctuary, as was the case formerly, with high walls" (τὸ ἁγίασμα καθὼς τὸ πρότερον ἐκύκλωσαν τείχεσιν ὑψηλοῖς). Lysias, seeing the strength of the walls, orders them to be torn down (1 M. vi. 62). But we find Jonathan again at the work of fortifying Mount Sion (x. 10 f.), in accordance with his plan of restoring the city (καινίζειν τὴν πόλιν), and establishing his power and the nation's revival. This aspiration of the nation is in the mind of Demetrius, who for political reasons promises to provide at his own expense for the renewing of the works of the sanctuary (ἐπικαινισθῆναι τὰ ἵερα), and for the building of the walls of Jerusalem (1 M. x. 44 f.). The building of the walls, as was the חנכת חומת ירושלם in Nehemiah's day, was the sign and seal of the restoration of the nation. The place given to the building of the wall by 1 M. is wanting in 2 M., and 1 M. has here preserved for us a true historical echo. The establishment of religion was not separate from the new foundation of the state. The building of the wall and the ordering of the temple-system in Neh. xii.–xiii. are the two symbols of the reality of a new commonwealth.

(*b*) *The Reinstitution of the Law.*—The enkainismos of the House and altar brought with it the restoration of the Law, which was essentially obedience to the prescriptions of the Cultus (*im Wesentlichen Kultusgesetz*; Schürer, *Gesch.*, Bd. p. 186). Both 1 and 2 M. are full of references to the Law; the attack of the oppressor was in the first place directed against it. The attempt of the Hellenizers was to make the Jewish people "forget the Law" (*ἐπιλαθέσθαι τοῦ νόμου*) and "to change all the ordinances" (1 M. i. 49). The story of the martyrs of the time, which 2 M. unfolds, is the story of the witnesses to the Law and the defenders of the Cultus. At last the day arrives when Judas and his army take the temple, free the city, and again "establish the laws which were on the verge of abolition" (*τοὺς μέλλοντας καταλύεσθαι νόμους ἐπανορθῶσαι*) (2 M. ii. 22). This connexion between Hanukkah and the Law is obviously in the mind of the Chronicler, who, after the description of the Hanukkah of the wall in Nehemiah xii., adds, "on that day they read in the Book of Moses" (Neh. xiii. 1).

(*c*) *The Institution of a Festival.*—On the model of 1 Kings viii. 66; 2 Chron. vii. 8; Ezra vi. 19 f., the Hanukkah of the House had as its concomitant a festival (2 M. ii. 12, *ὡσαύτως καὶ ὁ Σαλαμὼν τὰς οκτὼ ἡμέρας ἤγαγεν*). The complete ritual had not been instituted until this important part of the cultus had been initiated. The festival of Booths (1 Kings viii. 2; 2 Chron. vii. 10) of Tishri, the festival of the Passover (Ezra vi. 19 f.) in Nisan, could not serve as they had done on the former occasions of institution of the temple. It was the month of Kislev. Hochfeld (*Entstehung des Hanukkahfestes Z.A.V.*, 1902, p. 275 f.) rightly observes that the Epitomist has as his concern to give the festival of Hanukkah the sanction of scriptural authority, and to show that the actions of Judas were in harmony with the historical tradition of Moses, Solomon, Nehemiah (2 M. i. 10–ii. 18). Moffatt also (Charles, *Apoc.*, vol. i. p. 134) thinks that 2 M. finds an artificial precedent in the Hanukkah festival of 1 Kings viii. 66 and 2 Chron. vii. 8. But we must not suppose that this leaning upon Biblical authority began with 2 M. Already in Ezra vi. 19 f. we have the Hanukkah of the temple completed by a festival. On the occasions of revival of national life and national institutions, the models of the past were bound to furnish precedent.

Of the festival itself, 1 M. iv. 59 f. simply says that " Judas and his brethren and the whole congregation of Israel ordained that the days of the institution of the altar should be kept in their season year by year for eight days, from the 25th of the month Kislev, with gladness and joy." Nothing is said of the character of the festival beyond that it is one of rejoicing, of song and music (1 M. iv. 54). 2 M. offers much more. The festival had the character of the festival of Booths. It is called (2 M. i. 9) " Booths of the month Kislev " (*τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς σκηνοπηγίας τοῦ χασελεὺ μηνός*), the festival " of Booths and of the fire " (*σκηνοπηγίας καὶ τοῦ πυρός*, 2 M. i. 18).[1] 2 M. x. 6 f. describes the first celebration of the festival of Hanukkah, after the cleansing of the sanctuary, as being kept for eight days with gladness " after the manner of Booths " (*σκηνωμάτων τρόπον*) in memory of the time when, during Booths, the persecuted lived " like wild beasts in the mountains and the caves." The mode of celebration was the bearing of " wands wreathed with leaves and fair boughs and palms," and the singing of hymns of praise.

---

[1] Torrey and Moffatt (cf. Charles, *Apoc.*, vol. i. p. 133, *ad loc.*), on suggestion of the Syriac version, read *περὶ* (for *καὶ*) *τοῦ πυρός*, and with these words begin a new sentence. But, in view of the authority of LXX and 2 Maccabees' interest in the sacred fire (cf. i. 10, x. 3), the emendation is hazardous and improbable.

The reinstitution of the temple-worship, the cleansing and plenishing of the sanctuary, the initiation of the altar, were a series of acts complete in themselves. This was the Hanukkah of the House. Regarding the festival which attached to this event there are three principal explanations. It has been regarded as an imitation of the festival of Booths (Waehner, *de* חנוכה *sive festo encœniorum, usw.*, Helmstaedt, 1725; Grätz, *Gesch. d. Jud.*, Bd. ii. 2nd ed. p. 351 f.). This founds on the statements of 2 M. Or it is held to have been originally a festival of the simplest kind, commemorating the Hanukkah of the House merely in songs and rejoicings as described by 1 M. iv. 54, 59, and then, under reinterpretation, to have assumed the character of Booths, and later still, to have undergone further modification and change in respect of the rite of the lamp lit at the doors of the houses (Hochfeld, *ut sup. Z.A.W.*, 1902, p. 264 f.). The view of the festival which Krauss ("La Fête de Hanoucca," *R.E.J.*, tome 30, 1895, pp. 24 f., 204 f.) presents, combines features of the two foregoing representations. The rejoicings of Hanukkah were from the beginning regarded as compensation for Booths which the Syrian tyranny had proscribed, but in the days of Herod the character of the festival was changed and the rite of the Lamp was ordained by the scribes. Finally there is the view that the origins of the Hanukkah-festival and its symbols, the lights and the bearing of leafy branches, are to be sought outside Judaism (Wellhausen, *Isr. und jüd. Gesch.*, 1894, pp. 210, 257; *Nachr. von der Ges. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen*, p. 131. Cf. Ewald, *Gesch. d. Volkes Isr.*, iv. p. 407). What came to be the predominant rite of Hanukkah, the lighting of lamps, is, in our sources, variously interpreted, and continues to be so to-day. As having connexion with the Hanukkah of the House, however, the festival has one general characteristic which the title, "Festival of Dedication," has done much to obscure and diminish, namely, that of being a celebration of Jewish national restoration and of the new constituting of the State.[1]

---

[1] Cf. *The First Age of Christianity*, E. F. Scott, 1925, p. 16: "Again after four hundred years there was a Jewish kingdom, at the head of which stood the Maccabean or Asmonean house which had led the movement to liberty."

CHAPTER III

INTERPRETATIONS OF THE LIGHTS OF HANUKKAH

CHAPTER III

INTERPRETATIONS OF THE LIGHTS OF HANUKKAH

THE first Book of Maccabees regards the festival of Hanukkah from the point of view of its being commemorative of the reinstitution of the altar (1 M. iv. 56, 59). On the 25th of Kislev, three years previously, the altar had been profaned, and now on the same day in the same month, 164 B.C., sacrifice, "according to the Law," was offered upon the new altar (ver. 53). 1 M.'s interpretation of the festival of Hanukkah is that it is an annual festival of rejoicing because of this restoration of the altar and the sacrifice. "Judas and his brethren and the whole congregation of Israel ordained that the days of the institution of the altar should be kept in their season year by year for eight days . . . with gladness and joy" (ver. 59).

If the writer of 1 M. had intended to remark upon the ritual of lighting lamps at Hanukkah, an opportunity would have presented itself in the fourth chapter of his book. But to do so, evidently, was not his intention. To conclude, from his statement (ver. 54) that on the first occasion after the temple-service was reinstituted, when the event was celebrated with songs, music of harps, lutes, and cymbals, a decree was passed ordering an annual festival of "gladness and joy" (ver. 59), that the author knew of no definite ritual for Hanukkah is not permissible. He is only describing the festival's general character. Nor can any conclusion as to the origin or meaning of the lights of Hanukkah be drawn from his words (vers. 49–50): "And they made the holy vessels new, and they brought the Lamp-stand and the altar of burnt offerings and of incense, and the table, into the temple. And they burnt incense upon the altar, and they lit the lamps that were upon the Lamp-stand, and they shone in the temple" (*καὶ ἐξῆψαν τοὺς λύχνους τοὺς ἐπὶ τῆς λυχνίας, καὶ ἐφαίνοσαν ἐν τῷ ναῷ*). Lamps are reintroduced into the House; but that the author is governed in the information he gives, only by the aim to describe the replenishing of the temple with its *res sacræ*, is clear from the words in which he takes leave of the satisfactory result: "And they completed all the works which they did" (*καὶ ἐτέλεσαν πάντα τὰ ἔργα ἅ ἐποίησαν*, ver. 51). In the redundant sentence, "and they shone in the temple," there may lurk in the author's mind some interpretative connexion between the lamps of Hanukkah and the lighting of the temple-lamps, but we cannot be certain. The lighting of the lamps in the temple, which 1 M. mentions, is preliminary to setting the House in order and not an element in the celebration of the festival. But this does not enable us to infer, as Hochfeld does, that the writer of 1 M. knows nothing of a light-symbol for Hanukkah, and that originally the festival was celebrated without any such symbol.[1]

If it were true, as Hochfeld also believes (cf. note *infra*), that the author of 2 M., in whom the interest in religious matters is more pronounced than in 1 M., and in whom the interest in ritual is especially prominent, made no allusion to the light-symbol, then we might have more reason for assuming that lights were not at first a feature of our festival. 2 M. refers to the lamps (λύχνους, x. 3) in the same manner as does 1 M., as part of the enkainismos or plenishing of the temple, along with the incense and the shewbread. But in his procemium the Epitomist (2 M. i. 18) calls the festival one of " Booths and of the fire " (σκηνοπηγίας καὶ τοῦ πυρός). " As we intend to celebrate the cleansing of the temple on the 25th of Kislev we have thought it necessary to inform you, in order that you also may celebrate (the days) of Booths and of the fire (which was given) when Nehemiah offered sacrifices after he had built the temple and the altar " (cf. Kamphausen in *Kautzsch. Apok.*, vol. i. *ad loc.*, and Charles, *Apoc.*, vol. i.). Reconstruction of this awkward sentence in the Greek of 2 M. might invalidate the title of Hanukkah as festival " of Booths and of the fire," but would not impair at all our observation of the tense concentration of the author on the symbol of light as represented by the sacred fire required for the initiation of the altar to its service. The passage in the procemium (2 M. i. 18–36), with the narrative of the wonderful liquid which produced the fire for the new altar in Nehemiah's time, the further reference to the Biblical examples of fire descending from heaven (2 M. ii. 10 f.) to consume the sacrifice in the days of Moses (Lev. ix. 23–24) and of Solomon (2 Chron. vii. 1 f.), prepare the way, as patterns which history supplied, for the later account (2 M. x. 3) of the method employed for the rekindling of the fire upon the altar which had been restored by Judas. " After cleansing the sanctuary they made another altar, and striking sparks from stones, and obtaining fire from them (καὶ πυρώσαντες λίθους καὶ πῦρ ἐκ τούτων λαβόντες), they offered sacrifices after the lapse of two years." There can hardly be any doubt that the doctrine of the new fire for the altar is related to the character of Hanukkah as festival of " lights " in the mind of the author of 2 M. as closely as Booths is related to Hanukkah in another aspect of that festival, and that 2 M. offers these historical traditions of the sacred fire as an interpretation of the ritual of the lights. 2 M. does not give any prescription or *halakah* for the lamp, but does seek to offer an explanation of the light-symbol. In one important respect 2 and 1 M. are in agreement. 1 M. explains the festival of Hanukkah as commemorative of the reinstitution of the altar and of the legal sacrifice. 2 M., as far as the character of the festival as one of lights is concerned, also makes the point of origin the altar of burnt-offerings.

---

[1] Cf. Hochfeld, *Z.A.W.*, 1902, "Die Entstehung des Hanukkahfestes," p. 282. "Jedenfalls wissen 1 M. und 2 M. noch nichts von dem Lichtsymbol und das ist ausschlagend für die Annahme, dass die Lichter eine andere Entstehung haben müssen und anfänglich mit dem Hanukkah nichts mehr zu tun hatten."

On the supposition that Hanukkah is purely a commemorative festival, its ritual fashioned within Judaism in 164 B.C. without any outside influence, the interpretation of the lights which is presented by 2 M. cannot easily be dismissed. If we suppose an entirely Jewish origin for the festival, as serious competitor with the explanation of 2 M. only one other interpretation can stand beside it ; namely, that the festival of Hanukkah originally or later (cf. Hockfeld, *Z.A.W.*, p. 283) had the character of Booths, and that the light-symbol borrowed from Booths, sooner or later, took the form of the lamp of Hanukkah.

If we limit the field of search for the origin of the lights of Hanukkah, connecting them with some incident of the institution of the temple-service, the interpretation of the light-symbol given by 2 M. would be one that is in accord with conceptions within Judaism in the time in which Hanukkah arose. The statement in 2 M. x. 3 that the new altar-fire was generated by striking fire from stones, in all probability appeared in the history of Jason, perhaps was vouched for by eye-witnesses of the central act of the institution of the altar, and is doubtless historically true. The demand we perceive here is, that the fire for the cultus must not be ordinary or common. The ritual requires a special production of fire, a production which, even when due to ignition by means of oil or friction and therefore "natural," is none the less "fire from heaven." "Un feu venu du ciel pour les anciens n'était rien autre chose qu'un feu obtenu par les moyens imposés par le rituel. Le feu sacré passait pour venir du ciel. Or Festus dit, que primitivement on obtenait le feu sacré en allumant du bois par le frottement."[1] We have seen from the combined evidence of 1 and 2 M.—and we have no other evidence for the details of the Hanukkah of the House, than comes from them—that on the occasion of the restoration of the temple-service Biblical models were followed. Also in regard to the statement in 2 M. x. 3 as to the generation of the fire, we may believe that the records of the past were actually operative, in particular the two examples, Lev. ix. 23–24; 2 Chron. vii. 1 f., which the Epitomist himself gives of fire from heaven (*πῦρ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ . . . καταβὰν τὸ πῦρ κ.τ.λ.*, 2 M. ii. 10). That these two examples come from post-exilic sources shows that we have not to do merely with a harking back to older mythological conceptions, but with growing and living thought. The Chronicler, 300 B.C., is not satisfied with the account of the institution of the temple-service as narrated in 1 Kings viii., but introduces, what to him, from the point of view of the cultus, was of prime importance, the addition that the sacrifice was consumed by sacred fire.

---

[1] P. Saintyves, *Essais de Folklore biblique*, "Le feu qui descend du ciel," p. 24. Cf. Festus, *Ignis*, ed. Panckoucke, i. pp. 180–181.

Ewald (*Gesch. d. Volkes Israel,* 3rd ed. p. 407) supposes that the lights of Hanukkah are an adaption by Judaism of a general popular practice of lighting Winter-solstice fires. Did the conception of the heavenly fire enter into Judaism in like manner from a wide field of religious practice and belief? The sacred fire is known to many peoples. Horace speaks of an incense which lights of itself (*Satires,* v. 97–100); Pliny, of wood igniting on being placed on a sacred stone (*Nat. Hist.* ii. 3); Ctesias reports that the ancients knew of an oil which caused to burn that on which it is poured (cf. Saintyves, *ut sup.*, p. 23). Servius (*Æn.* xii. 200; *Ec.* vi. 42) states that Numa, skilled in the wisdom of Etruria, evoked the sacred fire by prayer, for the burning of the sacrifice upon the altar. The Vestal virgin, Emilia, by whose negligence the sacred fire was extinguished, by means of some secret art renewed the flame and escaped death. With the worship of Hephaistos, especially, was combined a reverence for the sacred fire. In an astonishing fullness not yet appreciated, Malten informs us ("Hephaistos," *Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll*), traces of the worship of this God are found throughout the whole of Asia Minor, particularly among the Karian-Lycian peoples, and very much more frequently than in Greece. On the island of Lemnos, not far from the town Hephaistias, lies the Mosychlos, on which a fire was visible from afar (πυρὸς αὐτόματοι φλόγες, Heraclit., *Allegor. Homer*, c. 26). Once a year this earth-fire was extinguished for nine days till the "new" fire was brought from the island of Delos. On the east coast of Lycia, not far from Phaselis, the fire of the Hephaistos-cult was, according to Seneca (*Epist.* 79: quod sine ullo nascentium damno ignis innoxius circumit), of a non-injurious nature. About fifty different places in Asia Minor are witnessed to as centres of this cult.[1] The miracle of the sacred fire, which Saintyves discovers as known to Greeks, Romans, Israelites, Syrians, and Persians, the writer of the Apocalypse (Rev. xiii. 13) regards as a mark of the power of the pagan priesthood—" and he (the Beast) doeth great wonders so that he maketh fire come down from heaven on the earth in sight of men." This is a testimony to the widely spread practice of the rite. The production of the new light in the church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem on Easter-Saturday by the clergy of the Christian church, and dating according to Schmaltz (*Palästina-Jahrbuch*, Berlin, 1917; cf. p. 64) soon after the completion of the Holy Sepulchre Church, the transference of the practice to the churches of Gaul and Spain, is further proof of the tenacity and popularity of this conception of the heavenly fire.[2]

Amid this mass of common belief in fire from heaven, Judaism had certainly its own tradition. The examples of heavenly fire which 2 M. cites from post-exilic literature are no doubt a variation of the earlier narratives of Elijah's sacrifice (1 Kings xviii. 33–38) and Gideon's offering (Jud. vi. 21) being consumed by fire from God. In these earlier occurrences, however, it is manifestly Jahveh the God of thunder and lightning who is thought of as agent. Jahveh, like the Gods of Semitic paganism,

---

[1] Malten, *loc. cit.*: "Denn in überraschenden und bisher nicht gewürdigter Fülle, wie sie auf griechischem Boden nirgends auch nur annähernd begegnet, findet sich der Gott über ganz Kleinasien am häufigsten auf karisch-lykischem Gebiete verbreitet. Wir begegnen hier altbezeugtem H.-Kult, Erdfeuer, deren Name und Erinnerung an H. haftet." "Die Reihe der kleinasiatischen H.-Zeugnisse—umfasst rund 50 verschiedene Orte."

[2] Schmaltz, *loc. cit.*: "Man wird die Entstehung (unserer Feier und zwar mit der Erzeugung des neuen Lichtes) kaum später als in die Mitte des 4. Jahrh. d. h. bald nach der Vollendung der Grabeskirche, setzen dürfen, musste sie doch dort erst eingebürgert sein, ehe sie von dort nach Gallien und Spanien verpflanzt werden konnte."

Baal Lebanon, and Baal Peor, is conceived of as God of the mountain. From Mount Sinai He utters his voice. Established in Zion and Jerusalem, His thunderous voice proclaims His coming to judgment (Amos i. 2)—יתן קולו. It is He who reveals Himself in the lightnings, the thick cloud, "the voice of the trumpet exceeding loud," upon Sinai (Ex. xix. 16, xx. 18; cf. 1 Kings xix. 11 f.), whose fire fell upon the altar Elijah had made, who carries off Elijah in the fiery chariot (2 Kings ii. 11 f.), who appears to Moses in the burning bush (Ex. iii. 2), and goes before Israel as the pillar of fire and smoke in their journeyings (Ex. xiii. 21, xiv. 19 f.). The cloud that filled Solomon's temple (1 Kings viii. 10) when the ark was brought in, the smoke that filled the House in Isaiah's vision (Isa. vi. 3, 4), are manifestations of the "glory," the כבוד of the thunder and lightning deity. The angel whose staff touching the rock causes fire to burst forth and burn up Gideon's sacrifice (Jud. vi. 21) is this deity's representative, as also is the angel who ascends in the flame which burns the offering of Manoah (Jud. xiii. 20). The destruction of certain of the children of Israel at Taberah (Num. xi. 1 f., in *J.E.*), when the anger of the Lord was kindled and His fire burst out upon them, must evidently be referred to the same conception. In the description of Abraham's covenant-offering (Gen. xv. 17), when smoke as from a furnace and a flame of fire (תנור עשן ולפיד אש) pass between the pieces of the sacrifice, the narrative is borrowing colours from the picture of the thunder cloud and the lightning flash. Jahveh's acceptance of the offering is intimated by the sending of the sacred fire.

Even to the latest periods, according to Stade (*Biblische Theol. d. A.T.*, 1905, p. 42) the phenomena of thunder and lightning supply the similitudes for the manifestations of Jahveh.[1] The occasions for the blowing of trumpets as mentioned in the *Mishnah* (Taʿanith, iii. 2 f.) are proof that this custom was intimately related with the original conception of the nature of the deity in Israel. Blowing of trumpets takes place when wells and cisterns have not sufficient rain to fill them, and on a fast for rain, on account also of all other evils, such as plague, locusts, fear of wild beasts, and of hostile armies. But the one exception placed upon this method of evoking God in time of trouble is noteworthy—the occasion of there being too much rain.[2] Symbol of man's cry to God, spiritualized to signify the trump of God awaking to penitence and thus beautifully represented by Maimonides (cf. Lund in *Mish.*, Sur., *ad loc.*; J. Abraham's art. "Trumpet," *H.B.D.*), the rite of trumpet-blowing retains in the thought of Rabbinic Judaism the mark of its being originally an imitative or homœopathic mode of causing the Thunder-God, Jahveh, to rend the clouds and send refreshing showers. The month in which the Shophar-blowing is most in prominence, is that of the rain-expectant period, the month of the three festivals—New-Year, Atonement, and Booths.

The instances of the sacred fire being obtained by Nehemiah and by Judas, which we find in 2 M., belong to a different category of thought than the early Biblical examples of sacrifices being consumed by the thunder and lightning God. The author of 2 M. leads us himself to the fountain and origin of his ideas of the fire from heaven, to a source where the nature of the deity is solar. The account of the renewing of the altar-fire in the days of Nehemiah has its setting in Babylonian, and more particularly in Iranian thought. The mingling of the religions of these peoples had become intimate and radical. As early as the Achæmenian period this syncretism had " begun to develop amply. From the East to the West of the Empire, cults were blended and gods allied " (Causse).[1] By the end of the Achæmenian Empire, writes Huart, " the magi were established in Babylon in great numbers and already took precedence over the native priesthood in official ceremonies. This long residence of the priests of fire in the old capital of Chaldea explains the combination of Iranian elements with Chaldean (*i.e.* star worship) which Mithraism presents." The Nehemiah-tradition which 2 M. cites does not disguise the source of its inspiration. The new fire for the altar, the author narrates, was secured in the following manner. At the beginning of the Babylonian captivity pious priests hide some of the sacred fire of the altar of the temple in the cavity of a well. On the restoration of Israel to its own land, after many years, Nehemiah sends descendants of those priests to the secret place in quest of the fire. They find there nothing but " thick liquid." This nevertheless is brought and sprinkled on the wood and on the sacrifices upon the altar. " After some time had elapsed, and the sun, formerly hidden in the clouds, had shone out, there was kindled a great blaze so that all men marvelled, and the priests offered prayer while the sacrifice was being consumed " (2 M. i. 22, 23). After prayer " the priests sang the hymns " (ver. 30). The liquid, the Epitomist informs us, was called " Naphthar," or " Nephthai," and when the Persian king heard of the well whence the sacred fire was obtained, he enclosed the spot as " a sacred enclosure." The oil, naphtha, from the earliest times called "Median" (*von den Alten ausdrücklich als ein medisches bezeichnet*: Riehm, *Handwörterbuch*, "Naphthar"; cf. Kautzsch, *Apok.*, Bd. i. *ad loc.*), the known sources of the substance, the interest of the Persian king in the procedure, the conduct of the proceedings by Nehemiah, the official of the Persian king, all speak one language as to the origin of the conceptions of the sacred fire in 2 M.[1] Where, again, the mention of naphtha is met with ("Prayer of Azariah," etc., ver. 23 in Charles' *Apoc.*, vol. i. p. 634) in the story of Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah in the fiery furnace, the scene is also Babylonian.

---

[1] Stade, *loc. cit.* p. 42: "Bis zu den spätesten Zeiten entlehnt die Schilderung des Erscheinens Jahvehs ihre Farben vom Gewitter."

[2] Mishnah Taʿanith iii. 8, על כל צרה . . . חוץ מרוב גשמים.

---

[1] Cf. *Ancient Persia and Iranian Civilization*, by Clément Huart, pp. xviii and 114.

But not only do the material, geographical, and personal elements in the legend of the Hanukkah of the altar by Nehemiah lead us to conclude that in 2 M., and even earlier than the days of Judas, the influence of Iranian fire-worship had penetrated Judaism. Side by side with 2 M.'s account may be placed the description which Pausanias gives of the cult of the Persian Artemis, as practised in Lydia, in Hiero-Cæsarea, and Hippæpa. "On entering the sanctuary the magus puts wood on the altar. But before this he has put a tiara on his head. Then in a tongue, barbarous and entirely unintelligible to the Greeks, he chants, in honour of I know not what God, an invocation which he reads from a book. The rite exacts that the wood burns without the aid of fire and gives forth a flame clearly visible to all around" (*Travels*, v. 27. 5). Herodotus (i. 131–132) and Strabo (xv. 3. 5) remark upon the magi chanting or singing during the sacrificial ceremony, and both Suidas (*v.* "Medusa") and Pseudo-Clement (*Recognitiones*, iv. 27–29) testify to the sacred fire over which the magi watched being regarded as fire "fallen from heaven."[1] According to 2 M., it was when the sun shone out that a great blaze arose and consumed the sacrifice. Here it is no longer Jahveh the "Gewitter-Gott," the Storm-God, who is thought of as lighting the wood for the offering with the lightning flame, but Jahveh the God of Heaven,[2] the Most-High, who sends the heavenly fire and kindles the sacrifice from the sun. To the Iranian, fire was the son of Ahura-Mazda, the Supreme God who, till other deities of astral nature later sprang up beside him, was conceived of as alone in the skies.[3] To the Assyrians and Babylonians fire was the son of Anu, the God of Heaven.[4] In the solar worship of Babylonia, Girru-Nusku, the fire-god who symbolized the heat of the sun and whom a hymn addresses as "founder of cities, restorer of sanctuaries," is the companion of Shamash. Of this fire-god it is said, "Without thee no sacrificial feast is held in E-kur, without thee Shamash the Judge does not execute any judgment."[5] In the narrative of Judas striking fire from stones to obtain fire for the Hanukkah of the altar, the solar-motif is not so apparent as in the account concerning

---

[1] Cf. Malten (*P.-W.-Kroll*, "Hephaistos"), *re* century-long Parsist cult of the holy flame at Baku. "Noch heute stehen dort an der Flamme die Tempel, und die Verehrung des heiligen Feuers ist bis in unsere Tage nicht unterbrochen worden" (Charles Marwin, *The Religion of the Eternal Fire*, London, 1884, 170 f., 176. Nöldecke, *Vorkommen und Ursprung des Petroleums*, Celle, 1883). For use of oil on the altar by magi, cf. Strabo, xv. 3. 14.

---

[1] Saintyves (*ut sup.*), p. 27 f. W. Geiger, *Ostiranische Kultur im Altertum*, Erlangen, 1882, p. 469.

[2] Possibly this title itself is a borrowing from the Persian. Cf. Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums*, 3rd ed. p. 312, note 5: "Der Ausdruck 'Gott der Himmel' scheint bewusste Anlehnung an fremde (persische) Religion zu sein." Cf. Bertholet, *Die religionsgesch. Probleme des Spätjudentums*, 1909, p. 10.

[3] Geiger (*ut sup.* p. 253): "Das Feuer heisst gradezu der Sohn des Ahura-Mazda: es ist sein irdisches Abbild gleicher Art und gleichen Wesens mit ihm selber." Cf. Clément Huart (*ut sup.*), p. 81.

[4] Jastrow, *Die Religion Babyloniens und Assyriens*, i. p. 296. (Saintyves, *ut sup.* p. 27.)

[5] Jastrow, "Religion of Babylonia," *H.B.D.* Extra vol. pp. 546, 554.

Nehemiah, but is none the less inherent. This fire, too, to the Epitomist and to the procurers of the fire was certainly *πῦρ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.* Wiedemann, describing the ceremonies of the Egyptian divine service as witnessed to by the texts of the prayers and by reliefs on the temple-walls, says that first among these ceremonies was "the striking or rubbing of the fire." A spark was generated by striking a flint or rubbing dry pieces of wood against each other, and "this spark was regarded as divine and as an effluence of the eye of the sun-god Horus."[1] Moulton (*Early Zoroastrianism*, Hibbert Lectures, 1912, p. 302) regards the prominence given to fire in Judaism and in the Zoroastrian religion to be a coincidence, and believes that the sacredness of fire as an emblem came to Iran and to Israel by totally different roads, the fire of Jahveh being originally the lightning. But in 2 M. we perceive that the line of original Jewish thought regarding the fire from heaven has been deflected. Nor is it this deflection that is so important as the emphasis that is now laid upon the necessity of sacred fire for the initiation of the altar. The interest in this sacred fire is a major motive of the Epitomist's introduction. If the description (2 M. x.) of the method Judas employed to obtain heavenly fire at the Hanukkah of the altar comes, as is probable, from Jason of Cyrene who, according to Schürer (*Gesch.*, Bd. iii. p. 484), must have written not long after 161 B.C., we may suppose he is describing what actually had become an essential of the cultus, an essential which 2 Chron. vii. 1 f. retrospectively transfers back to the Hanukkah in the time of Solomon, as P (Lev. ix. 23–24) had done to the time of Moses. In the narrative of 1 Kings viii. (cf. ver. 62) the altar is at once ready for use, as it is in Ex. xx. 24, and there is no indication of its

---

[1] "Religion of Egypt," *H.B.D.*, extra vol. p. 192.

Hanukkah by sacred fire. Nor does Ezekiel, careful though this prophet-priest be in regard to the ceremonial observances of religion which are to be performed when the temple is rebuilt, make the slightest allusion to this rite. But in Ezek. xliii. 18 f. (cf. xlv. 18 f.), though the author presumably is founding upon pre-exilic ritual of the Haṭṭath sacrifice, the arrangements preparatory (ביום העשותו) to the use of the altar, it must be held, are an advance upon the custom of former times. The altar, in the restored theocracy, must, according to his plan, be cleansed, unsinned, and reconciled (טהר, חטא, כפר in Ezekiel are synonymous terms. See Stade, *Bib. Theol. d. A.T.*, p. 166) for seven days before being put to service. The victims whose blood is smeared upon the altar are, for the first day a bullock, and on the six following days a goat. After the Exile, as S. R. Driver and H. A. White ("Day of Atonement," *H.B.D.*, iv. pp. 199–200) observe, "the ceremonial aspects of sin and atonement at least occupied a more prominent place in the life and thought of the people than was the case previously." Now this growth of prominence of the idea of atonement may, of course, have been satisfied with expiatory rites, the tradition of which was oral but fixed. But more probably it was not thus satisfied. In this case, where first use of the temple-altar is concerned, in the circumstances a necessarily rare event, we may doubt, especially in view of 1 Kings viii., that there was any fixed priestly prescription prior to Ezekiel's requirements. When P (Ex. xxix. 36, 37) eventually prescribes, for unsinning the altar and preparing it for first use, a ritual similar to that of Ezek. xliii. 18 f., but "with more costly victims" (Robertson Smith, *O.T. in Jewish Church*, p. 376), we may conclude that development of ceremonial followed upon the greater prominence of ideas of atonement and cleansing in exilic and post-exilic days. Ezekiel represents the bridge between the customs of former times and the requirements of P and the Chronicler. In Lev. vi. 13 we have now the ordinance that fire should be kept burning continually upon the altar and never permitted to go out, a prescription which is fundamental to Iranian practice (Strabo, xv. 3, 15; Geiger, *ut sup.*, pp. 254, 472; Schroeder, *Arische Religion*, vol. ii. p. 494 f.). Lev. ix. 23–24 and 2 Chron. vii. 1 f. (cf. 1 Chron. xxi. 26), in their accounts of the heavenly fire initiating the altar, belong to the same fabric of thought, and we must see in them, in spite of the older traditions exercising influence, a result of exilic and post-exilic experience of Chaldean-Iranian practice. In founding upon them the author of 2 M. was not employing merely Midrashic exegesis. To the process whereby the doctrine of fire from heaven, common to Jewish and Iranian belief, receives in Judaism a later influence from the Iranian source, there is a significant parallel in the eschatological thought of both peoples. With both, eschatology is of independent origin, and yet there takes place a transformation of Jewish eschatology later by Parsism, in respect of, among other elements, the place of fire in the world-judgment. Though the judgment upon Israel is not seldom in the O.T. (Isa. i. 22 f., xlviii. 10; Mal. iii. 2 f., etc.) compared to a cleansing of metal through fire, in the picture of the world-judgment in Dan. vii., the fiery stream that issues from before the Ancient of Days reveals, as does the description of the Ancient One Himself, dependence upon Zoroastrian religion. Here fire is no longer symbolism or comparison, but, as in Zoroastrianism, the actual elemental power, executive of the world-judgment.[1] It would be indeed strange had those aspects of Iranian fire-theology, associated with the rites of religion and more popularly conspicuous, made less impression on Judaism than did the Iranian conception of fire as agent of world-judgment on Jewish eschatological thought.

---

[1] Eduard Meyer, *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, Bd. ii. pp. 184 f., 198: "An allen diesen Stellen (*A.T.*) ist das Bild vom

It may be assumed that in explaining the light-symbol of Hanukkah by the sacred fire which instituted the cultus, the author of 2 M. had actually in view the practice of hanging lamps at the house-doors (Baba Qamma vi. 6; cf. Scholion to Meg. Taʿan. ix.) on Hanukkah, and that the sacred fire is for him commemorated by the lamp. That the festival in his day was celebrated altogether as Booths, and by illumination of the women's court of the temple, we shall have occasion to show later is not admissible. From the point of view that 2 M. interprets the lamp, if we suppose that the lighting of lamps was connected from the beginning with the above-named incident at the Hanukkah of the House, the explanation given is one which may not be without support of analogy. In Ex. xxxv. 3 (P) there is given the command, "You shall not kindle fire in all your dwellings on the Sabbath-day." G. Beer has suggested, with some consent, that this ordinance derives from the Persian custom of allowing no lights or fires in private dwellings on certain festivals, but only in the temple, and that the custom of kindling the Sabbath-lamp on the evening before the Sabbath, while meeting the prohibition of Sabbath-work, exhibits direct or indirect influence from the

Feuer und Metall lediglich ein Gleichnis und es handelt sich um die Ausscheidung des Edelmetalls aus den Schlacken; bei Daniel dagegen ist die Schilderung durchaus nicht symbolisch gemeint, sondern der Feuerstrom—die lodernden Räder—sind eben so real wie der Uralte." "Das Weltgericht vollzieht sich wie bei Zoroaster durch einen gewaltigen Feuerstrom."

Persian practice.[1] A picture of Judaism in Babylonia under the Sassanid dynasty, when Zoroastrianism, after a decline under the Parthians, blossomed again into new life, is commentary on the Persian rite, which Beer conjectures had already left its mark upon Jewish custom at an earlier period. The Magian priests (*Maubads*) " on certain festival-days on which the light was worshipped as the visible image of Ahura, suffered no fire to be on the hearth, no light in the room. On such days the Maubads forced their way into the Jewish houses, extinguished the fire, and took in their sacred fire-pans the glowing coals, in order to present them as offerings in the fire-temple " (Kohut, *Über die jüdische Angelologie und Demonologie, usw.*, p. 12). The common fire was thus purified by being brought to the general place of fire and " united " with the sacred fire there. In these later days of persecution we have the rite, which forbade fire and light in private dwellings on certain days, practised on the soil from which, if Beer's conjecture be accepted, long before, under the peaceful Persian dominion, some influence of it had spread to Judaism. The Sabbath-lamp is held to be of early Pharisaic origin (*Jewish Ency.*, vol. vii.; Lamp, Sabbath). If it be a custom which can be traced to the Iranian light-religion, representing a Jewish adaptation, in accordance with its own spirit, of a practice associated with the sacred fire, the interpretation of the lamp of Hanukkah as symbol of the sacred fire essential for the altar in the days of Judas, finds an analogy both in the form of celebration adopted, and in thought. But whether this hypothesis concerning the Sabbath-lamp holds or not, if Hanukkah as festival of "lights" commemorates some event in the Hanukkah of the House, and did not connect with practices which were already in existence on 25th Kislev in pre-Maccabean times, the explanation of the lamp by 2 M. must be given first rank as an interpretation. It accords with the conceptions of the age. It is only when we regard, as we must, the Epitomist's version of the festival in respect of its likeness to Booths and its character as festival "of the fire" as itself an apologetic of Hanukkah from a Pharisaic standpoint, as a re-interpretation, that we can pass it over. The forerunners of the Pharisees, the Hasidim, may possibly have had some influence upon the shaping and interpreting of ritual in 164 B.C., but the succeeding years, with altered relationships between Pharisees and Hasmoneans, could call for a revision of interpretation.

---

[1] G. Beer, *Der Mischnatractat* "*Sabbat,*" Tübingen, 1908, to Sab. ii. 1 f. pp. 46, 50: " Das Verbot Licht anzuzünden am Sabbat, wird meist nur als eine Konsequenz aus dem Verbot aller Arbeit am Sabbat (Ex. xx. 10; Lev. xxiii. 8) angesehen. Aber kommt man mit dieser Auskunft ganz aus? Rabe, und so auch Sammter, sagt nach Raschi zu Schab. ii. 5, dass die Perser an gewissen Festen in keinem andern Hause als dem Tempel Licht zu brennen dulden. *Liegt hier eine blosse Parallele vor?* . . . Ist nicht möglich, dass unter dem Einfluss des persischen Brauchs der jüdische enstand, dessen Ausübung dann das Verbot der Sabbatarbeit entgegenkam? " p. 50. " Sollte nicht das Illuminieren am Sabbat, am Versöhnungstag und am Tempelweihfest auf mittelbaren oder unmittelbaren *persischen* Einfluss weisen? " Cf. Novack Traktat-Sabbath, Sab. ii. 6, p. 42. Max Haller, " Das Judentum " (*Sch. d. A.T.*, 1914), p. 193, thinks that the Persian rite " sehr wohl auf die jüdische Festsitte abgefärbt haben kann."

We now come to the explanations of the lights at Hanukkah, as given by writings posterior to 1 and 2 M. Josephus, who (*Ant.* xii. 7. 6) describes the Hanukkah of the House in the aspect of its replenishing with the sacred objects of the cultus, the re-institution of the temple-service, and in particular, the restoration of the sacrifice (xii. 7. 7), states that the festival has been celebrated from Judas' time to his own, and is called "lights" (or "lamps"; cf. xii. 6. 6, *ἥψαν τε φῶτα ἐπὶ τῆς λυχνίας*). "We call it lights," he says, "because, I suppose, this power (liberty of worship) appeared to us beyond our hopes" (*καλοῦντες αὐτὴν φῶτα, ἐκ τοῦ παρ' ἐλπίδας οἶμαι ταύτην ἡμῖν φανῆσαι τὴν ἐξουσίαν*). This purely symbolic interpretation, which Kittel calls "helpless" and betraying that Josephus himself was conscious of its being unsatisfactory,[1] may not be altogether useless when evidence of the origin of the festival accumulates. But meanwhile we can place it aside as it chooses to explain the concrete entirely from the abstract.

The interpretations which Rabbinic literature offers explain the rite of the lamp by incidents connected with the restoration of the cultus. Talmud Babli Sab. 21, b. narrates that "when the Greeks entered the temple they defiled all the oils that were in the temple. And when the kingdom of the house of the Hasmoneans prevailed and conquered, on search being made, only one vase of oil was found with the seal of the high priest on it. There was only sufficient oil in the vase for one day's use. By miracle, however (נעשה בו נס), they had light from it for eight days. In the year following they ordained an eight days' celebration with hymns and thanksgivings" (בהלל והודאה).[2] This legend may be considerably older than the sources in which it is contained. It has appropriated to itself, as explanation of the eight days of the festival and of the Hanukkah-lamp, the motif of the Biblical narrative of the widow's cruse of oil. The oil for the lighting of the temple is guaranteed as pure by the high priest's seal. We have here the result of later reflection which weighs the fact that those who had been in contact with slain Gentiles could not prepare ritually pure oil till seven days had elapsed (Houting, *Rosh. hash.* i. 3; Surenh. *Mish.*).[1] But the story is of significance in certain important respects. The eight days of Hanukkah are no longer, as in 2 M., after the model of the festival of Booths. This statement of 2 M. is ignored. The incident of the lighting of the lamps of the temple, though to 1 M. it may be only but one incident among others, is here the chief feature, also the simplicity of the festival as celebrated with Hymns and thanksgivings accords with 1 M.'s description (1 M. iv. 47 f.). It may also be asked if we have not to see in this legend of Sab. 21, b., with this new oil-miracle a conscious opposition to the miracle of the oil and sacred-fire of 2 M. i. 18 (x. 1 f.), which had become less acceptable to an age more suspicious of the religions of the nations. A Biblical miracle is substituted for that which was favourite on Iranian soil and spheres of influence. The Talmud Babli came to the west from Babylonia. The collecting and fixing of its traditions was due not only to the vast increase of these traditions themselves, but also to the persecution of the Jews in the Persian kingdom by the Sassanids Jezdegerd II. (A.D. 438–457) and Peroz (A.D. 459–484). The latter sought to close the schools and compel the Jews to accept the Persian religion.[2] That Babli should hand down this particular version of the festival of lights is indirect but strong evidence of the source of the conceptions in 2 M.'s account of the festival, which are witnessed to by that document as prevailing in Palestine at the beginning of the Maccabean period. The Talmud passage (Gittin. 17, a.) which describes the molestation of the Jews of Babylonia under Sassanid rule, through the fanatical priestly observance of the fire-rites,[1] permits us to see the reason of their sensitive aversion to what, they were only too consciously aware, was a heathen custom.

---

[1] R. Kittel, *Die hellenistische Mysterienreligion und das A.T.*, p. 21: "Deutlicher kann die Hilflosigkeit nicht zum Ausdruck gebracht werden. Josephus fühlt, wie ungenügend seine Erklärung ist." Cf. Krauss, "Fête de Hanoucca," *R.E.J.*, tome xxx. 1895, p. 24 f. Cap. on "H. Fête des Lumières": "Josèphe qui connait la fête des lumières, explique cette dénomination d'une manière si forcée."

[2] Sab. 21, b: שכשנכנסו יוונים להיכל טמאו כל השמנים שבהיכל וכשגברה מלכות בית חשמונאי ונצחום בדקו ולא מצאו אלא פך אחד של שמן שהיה מונח בחותמו של כהן גדול ולא היה בו אלא להדליק יום אחד נעשה בו נס והדליקו ממנו שמונה ימים לשנה אחרת קבעום ועשאום ימים טובים בהלל והודאה. Cf. also the same in Megillath Taʿanith (Scholion), cap. ix. in *Anec. Oxon.*, parts 4–6, Sem. Series, 1887 (A. Neubauer).

---

[1] Houting, *ad loc.*: "quia tetigerunt gentiles occisos et sic nam poterant oleum mundum ante septem dies purificationis suae."

[2] H. L. Strack, *Einleitung in den Talmud*, 4th ed. p. 67 f.

Another account interpretive of the lights of Hanukkah is contained in the Pesikta rabbathi and in a scholion of the Megillath Taʿanith (ix.).[2] These tell that at the time the sons of the high priest Hasmonai defeated the Greeks, on entering the sanctuary they found seven (eight) spears of iron, which they fixed so that they could light the lamps on them. The situation, we may picture to ourselves, is that in the time of the persecutions the seven-branched lamp-stand had been removed, and these spears served as temporary substitutes on the recapture of the temple. To this story Krauss (*ut sup.*) attaches credence on the ground that it is from two Palestinian sources, and has the support of another tradition that these spears were covered by the Hasmonean princes first with brass, then with silver, and later with gold. These sources, he says, have kept the "relations authentiques sur ce point," and suggests that the story had influence upon the introduction of the lamp as a souvenir of Hasmonean days at a later time. Both P. rabbathi and Meg. Taʿan. hand down the tradition in answer to the question, "Why do they light lamps?" Hochfeld (*Z.A.W.*, *ut sup.*, p. 273 f.), who substantially agrees with Krauss in his theory of the customs of Hanukkah being subject to development, believes that the story of the seven spears contains the same trace of later reflection and of motive as is discernible in the oil-miracle of Sab. 21, b. Men of blood and warfare could not touch the lamp-stand with their hands. They lit the lamps with long spears and thus rendered the act clean; or the lamp-stand itself was regarded, as yet, as unclean, and spears were used instead. Though the tradition itself contains nothing miraculous, on any element of historical truth it may have we cannot venture to found. From a religious-historical standpoint it is less valuable than that of Sab. 21, b.

---

[1] Kohut (*ut sup.*), p. 13, *re* Rabba bar Chana.

[2] Pesikta rabbathi, c. ii. p. 5a, ed. Friedmann: ולמה מרליק נרות בתנוכה אלא בשעה שנצחו בניו של חשמונאי הכהן הגדול למלכות יון . . . נכנסו לבית המקדש מצאו שם שמונה שפודים של ברזל וקבעו אותם והרליקו בתוכם נרות. Meg. Taʿan. ix., *Anec. Oxon.*: ומה ראו להדליק את הנרות אלא בימי מלכות יון שנכנסו בני חשמונאי להיכל (ושבעה שפודים של ברזל [היו] בידם וחפום בעץ) והדליקו בהם את הנרות.

Inquiry into the origin and meaning of the lights of Hanukkah is thus cast back upon the earliest documents which record the festival (1 and 2 M.). It is therefore necessary to deal here with the theory of Krauss that the custom of lighting lamps at Hanukkah is reflected neither in 1 nor 2 M., but was a practice which arose in the time of Herod, and at that period was engrafted on the festival previously celebrated in the manner of Booths (2 M. i. 9). The first evidences for the lamp, he sees in the discussions of the schools of Shammai and Hillel on the question of diminishing or increasing the number of lamps as the days of the festival took their course (Sab. 21, b.; cf. Goldschmidt, *Talm.*, p. 365), the φῶτα of Josephus, and the reference in Baba Qamma, vi. 6. These belong to the time after Herod. In the days of this king, the festival of Hanukkah, which, as 2 M. (x. 6) records, was held as compensating for the interruption of Booths in the Maccabean revolution, had long lost, in this aspect, its inner necessity. As a commemoration of the restoration of the temple, it was further deprived of meaning by the raising of the splendid and magnifical temple of Herod. The *political* significance of Hanukkah as recalling the heroic deeds of the Hasmoneans had to be kept in the background by the king as it might offend the Romans. Herod was a friend of the Romans, and he himself did not like the Hasmoneans to be talked of. At this juncture and in these circumstances, the scribes struck upon a plan of perpetuating in silence the memory of their Maccabean rulers. They instituted the custom of lighting lamps. The wars and the struggle for freedom which the Maccabees had waged, thus passed " à l'arrière-plan," and the *religious* significance of the festival was emphasized. Herod had no objection to this. And thus from the old Hanukkah there was born a new festival, and as this was established in the time of Herod, people could speak of it as the " festival of Herod."[1] The incident of the spears would supply to the new custom of lamps the foundation needed for popular acceptance.

In behalf of these contentions and of the belief that the festival in its new guise received the name " festival of Herod," Krauss seeks to find support in the lines of the Roman satirist, Persius (*Sat.* v. 179–184), who there speaks of the " days of Herod ": " But when the days of Herod come round and the lamps wreathed with violets and set at the greasy windows have spat out their heavy vapour, when the tail of the tunny overlapping the red dish floats in its sauce and the white jar brims with wine, you move your lips in silence and grow pale over the circumcised sabbath."[1] This reference to the "Herodis dies" and the lamps, Krauss holds, implies the festival of Hanukkah. In this he is in agreement with Derenbourg who, however, thought the poet wrote under a misconception "days of Herod" instead of "Hasmonean days."[2] The construction which Krauss has built up is not without strength in several of its elements. The scheme of the doctors of the law may have been within the scope of their authority and rendered necessary by changed conditions. That the thought of Hanukkah as a festival of compensation for the interruption of Booths more than a century before, if ever strong, would fade, and that the new temple of Herod might cast a shadow upon the memories of the former temple, must be granted. But that the lights of Hanukkah date only from the days of Herod and under such conditions and owing to such motives as Krauss supposes, is far more than improbable. 2 M., with its zeal for the celebration of the days of "Booths and of the Fire," its painstaking descriptions of the different occasions this sacred fire appeared, the Biblical and traditional examples of the fire emerging, convinces us that the author knew of Hanukkah as a festival with two marked characteristics. One was similarity to the festival of Booths; and the other, in which Hanukkah was apparently distinguished from Booths and the illuminations of Booths, required interpretation by reference to the sacred fire. The two aspects of the festival are given each a religious foundation by 2 M. It is not difficult to see which feature of the festival is the more prominent in the view of the Epitomist. Both belong to the δρώμενα of Hanukkah as celebrated in his day, as he desires them to be celebrated by the Jews in Egypt, and as he represents them as having had the signature of the senate and Judas (i. 10b f.). The author shows he knows of a light-symbol distinct from that of Booths. The theory of Krauss might gain more substance by resort to a literary criticism of 2 M. which placed that book later than the days in which the doctors of the law met and conceived their scheme. But this he does not undertake.

---

[1] *R.E.J.*, tome xxx. 1895, p. 35 f.: " Probablement que les docteurs d'alors, par opposition contre le roi et pour honorer la glorieuse époque asmonéenne, se virent amenés a établir une fête spéciale qui perpétuât en silence, et par cela même d'une façon plus sûre, le souvenir des Asmonéens. À cet effet, ils proclamèrent Hanukkah fête des lumières, faisant ainsi passer les guerres et les luttes à l'arrière-plan et marquant d'avantage la signification religieuse. Hérode ne pouvait pas faire d'objection à une pareille fête. De l'ancien Hanoucca est sortie une fête nouvelle, et comme cette institution nouvelle s'est établie au temps d'Hérode, on a pu lui donner le nom de fête d'Hérode."

---

[1] Persius, *Sat.* 179–184:

"At quum
Herodis venere dies unctaque fenestra
Dispositae pinguem nebulam vomuere lucernae
Portantes violas, rubrumque amplexa catinum
Cauda natat thynni, tumet alba fidelia vino:
Labra moves tacitus recutitaque sabbata palles."

[2] *Essai sur l'Histoire*, etc., p. 164: "Persius, *Sat.* v. 180 et suiv. parle d'une fête célébrée par les Juifs sous le nom de *Herodis dies* mais toute le contexte montre qu'il s'agit dans ces vers des jours de Hanoucca (voy. p. 62) et que le poète romain a mis à la place des Asmonéens, Hérode, nom répandu et connu à Rome."

Further, the design of the scribes in the time of Herod, partly in opposition to the king (*par opposition contre le roi*) and partly meeting his and the Romans' wishes, to cause the political implications of the Hasmonean period to be forgotten, yet to establish its remembrance silently but the more certainly, seems subtle but is strikingly ill-conceived. To light up Jewish cities in Palestine and the Ghettos of the diaspora with lamps on the Hanukkah-days, so that the Gentile satirist, as Krauss believes, had his attention drawn to the fact, and chose it among all the other marks of Judaism as target for his satire, was hardly a method that would deceive Herod or the Romans. This *silent* commemoration of the Hasmoneans would be most eloquent. Jewish tradition itself speaks of the Emperor Trajan's wrath being directed against the Jews because of the

Hanukkah-lamps.[1] It was no inconspicuous custom.[2] To equip a festival, whose connexions with the memories of the struggles and glories of the past were ever becoming looser and fainter, with a new and very visible symbol would increase its political significance and could scarcely meet with no objection on the part of Herod.

Moreover, that a Roman poet has retained the only trace of this new title of Hanukkah, "festival of Herod," is singular. A reading of his verse suggests that he is speaking of the Jewish Sabbath. Schürer (*Gesch.*, Bd. iii. 3rd–4th ed., p. 166, Anm. 49) interprets the "lucernæ" mentioned by Persius, therefore, as the Sabbath-lamps, and the "dies Herodis" as the Jewish Sabbaths observed by King Herod (*die vom König Herodes gefeierten jüdischen Sabbathe*). According to Krauss, this latter exegesis is a "forced explanation." But the phrase, "dies Herodis," whatever it intends,[3] cannot be rendered except by some such verbal explanation as Schürer gives. To Persius (A.D. 34–62), Herod, through his connexion with Rome and the tradition of his infamy, would be the well-known "King of the Jews," and his "days" would be those days which the Jews kept, the Sabbaths which excited the interest and the mockery of the Roman world and its writers. Juvenal tested his satirical power on the Sabbath custom of "indolence" (*Sat.* xiv. 105–106, septima quaeque fuit lux ignava), as also did Tacitus (*Hist.* v. 4, otium . . . inertia).[1] Persius seems to have regarded the Sabbath as rather a heavy day in the matter of food.[2] It is in this context of satire upon the "circumcised Sabbath" we must place his reference to the "days of Herod." It is worthy of note, in view of the objection raised to the explanation of Schürer as "forced," that Professor Sellar speaks of Persius' "perverse fashion of forced and exaggerated expression," his "excessive realism," and "contortions of metaphor."[3] All these qualities are contained in the lines of Persius cited. Grammarians and exegetes have difficulty with his work, but here is little question as to which exegesis is natural. Historic trace, then, of the decision of the scribal conclave who instituted lamps at Hanukkah in the days of Herod cannot be found.

---

[1] Cf. *Kommentar zum N.T. aus Talmud und Midrash*, Strack und Billerbeck, 1924, Bd. ii. p. 541. Midr. Esther, i. 16 (56b).

[2] Cf. Sab. 23, a., אמר רב הונא, etc. Maimonides, *Hilkoth Meg. wa-Hanukkah*, cap. iv. 10.

[3] Cf. *Persii Flacci Sat.*, Lib. ed. by A. Pretor, 1868, p. 86, who writes: "The birthday of Herod the Great is meant according to the schol., an explanation which is borne out by Jerome, who mentions that Herod was one of two kings who caused their birthday to be observed in this manner." But Persius is not referring to the birthday of the dead king as kept by Jews! Herod's death *did give* occasion to rejoicing. Cf. Meg. Taʿan. § 25.

When also we have regard to festival-customs, which have generally the habit and wonderful tenacity of maintaining their features, even when conditions of civilization have changed, it is improbable that the lamps Persius saw in the windows of the Jewish dwellings were Hanukkah-lamps. These were placed at the doors, to the outside, and we find them thus in the first casual reference to their position in *Mishnah*, B.Q. vi. 6, and the placing of them there, as prescription (מצוה) of the commentary to Meg. Taʿan. ix., of Sab. 21, b, and of Maimonides' *Hilkoth Megillah wa-Hanukkah*, iv. 7. That is, we discover the custom unvaried in its practice for a period of a thousand years. Only in certain circumstances which these last three sources mark out were the Hanukkah-lamps to be set in the window (בחלון). The dwellers in upper storeys could put them there.[1] In times of molestation by mockers the lamp was to be placed on the inside of the house-door; in days of persecution it might be set on the table. It has to be surmised that behind the first indication of this custom of hanging the light on the post of the door of the house, outside, there lies a long period of an unchanged ritual, extending, indeed, to the very beginning of the institution.[2]

---

[1] Cf. Schürer, *Gesch.*, Bd. iii. p. 153: "Besonders drei Dinge waren es, welche der Spott der gebildeten Welt sich zur Zielscheibe wählte: die Enthaltung von Schweinefleisch, die strenge Sabbatfeier und die bildlose Gottesverehrung."

[2] Hanukkah was celebrated in the days of Judas, according to Josephus (*Ant.* xii. 7. 7), by pleasure and by feasting the people on the sacrifices (peace-offerings). The later custom was to have sumptious meals at this season, particularly on the Sabbath in Hanukkah. (Cf. G. Buchanan Gray, *Sacrifice in the Old Testament*, p. 291; Schroeder, *Gebräuche des Talmudisch-Rabbinischen Judentums*, p. 98 f.; Abrahams, *Jewish Life*, p. 135.) But the Sabbath itself was a day of enjoyment, of good cheer, and the Book of Jubilees, which contains the minutest regulations for the Sabbath of pre-Christian times, stresses the duty of eating and drinking on that day (2. 21, 31; 50. 9, 10)—an acknowledgment, Beer (*Mishnah-Traktat*, p. 23) conjectures, of the necessity of compensating for the tedium and boredom of absolute rest.

[3] *Ency. Brit.*, 9th ed. vol. xviii., "Persius," p. 664.

The theory of Krauss that Hanukkah has been subject to development from Maccabean days onwards has been strengthened by Hochfeld (*ut sup.*, p. 275 f.). Hochfeld pictures the festival of Hanukkah as at first eight days of rejoicing and song (1 M. iv. 44; 2 M. x. 7), then on the breach between the Pharisees and the Hasmoneans, 106 B.C., the *terminus a quo* for the writing of 2 M., a change in the festival took place through the Pharisees reinterpreting the festival, in order to eliminate any element that could minister to the personal honour and fame of the Hasmoneans. Biblical character and sanction was now given the festival by its being regarded as a second Booths, on the analogy of the second Passover (פסח שני). 2 M. reflects this stage of progress. After this, for a while Hanukkah was celebrated in all respects as Booths, and owes its lights to this. But as a second Booths, and having thus the nature of an after-celebration, "people perhaps contented themselves with a lesser, domestic illumination."[1] This variation of Hanukkah from Booths now becomes the peculiar mark of the festival, as one of "lights." But this description of the evolution of Hanukkah he bases on the statement that neither 1 nor 2 M. know anything of a light-symbol for Hanukkah—at best, an argument from silence in the case of 1 M., in the purpose of which book more than a general reference to the national festival hardly lay, and altogether unjustified in the case of 2 M. It is the light-symbol which 2 M. interprets. And interpretation (*Umdeutung*) is a method which is employed when the power to change a custom is impossible or impracticable.

---

[1] Cf. Strack und Billerbeck, Bd. ii., *ut sup.*, p. 540. Meg. Taʿan. ix. (p. 16, Neubauer): ומצוה להניחה על פתח ביתו מבחוץ ואם היה דר בעליה מניחה בחלון הסמכה לרשות הרבים ואם מתירא מן הלצים מניחה על פתח ביתו מבפנים ובשעת הסכנה מניחה על שולחנו ודיו).

[2] From the disputes of the schools of Shammai and Hillel (cf. Sab. 21, b), whether a person (or family) begin the festival with eight lamps, lighting one less each successive day (בית שמאי), or begin with one lamp, lighting one more each day (בית הלל), argument cannot be made either for the custom of the lamp being ancient or recent. The discussion is merely which practice is the more meritorious work (המהדרין)—a question of which is the better work of supererogation. Both schools recognize the prescription of the festival which required only the one lamp for a man and his family at the door during the eight days of Hanukkah. The discussion is not about the custom of the lamp itself. The display of lights (lamps, candles) at the windows by children on Hanukkah (see Oesterley and Box, *Religion and Worship of the Synagogue*, 1907, p. 376) would appear to be a concession of later times, as our sources (cf. p. 134 f. below) are very definite in their restriction on setting lights elsewhere than at the doors.

For the origin of the institution of the Hanukkah-lamp, and for the character of the festival itself as one of "lights," our investigation leads us to the conclusion that we cannot remain satisfied with the interpretation offered by 2 M. that the festival is commemorative, in this aspect, of the sacred fire. We must, therefore, search above the chronological line of the books of Maccabees, more narrowly scanning what the sources of these books reveal of the religious conditions of the pre-Maccabean period and the civilization in which that period is set. The festival of Hanukkah would naturally always retain a commemorative character, recalling the initiation of the altar and the freedom wrought by the Maccabees. Its symbols, however, do not give the impression of having been *invented* in the time of Judas, as merely appropriate expressions to call to remembrance and to rejoicing. Krauss perceives that some incident connected with the restoration of the House cannot adequately explain the lights of Hanukkah. He refuses to seek for their *raison d'être* prior to 1 and 2 M. He would also exclude any orientation of research which would detect other than purely Jewish elements in the festival of lamps.[1] That Hanukkah has its foundation in a Hellenistic festival may appear to be more certain when we examine that other aspect in virtue of which Hanukkah is described as festival of "Booths of the month of Kislev" (2 M. i. 9).

---

[1] P. 283: "Dieser Nachahmung der am Hüttenfest üblichen Bräuche verdanken jedenfalls die Lichter des H. ihren Ursprung—Vielleicht begnügte man sich an Hanukkah als der Nachfeier mit einer kleineren häuslichen Illumination"; cf. p. 282, *ibid.* (see p. 60, note 1, above).

[1] Krauss may be said to detect foreign influence in one aspect. Hanukkah, in his view, is especially a women's festival (see also Oesterley and Box, *ut sup.*, p. 377, *re* modern celebration of Hanukkah); but this notion and the still more fanciful one which connects this so-thought speciality with the "*ius primae noctis*" have been adequately examined and justly dismissed by Levi (see Literature, p. xviii). Had Hanukkah in its origin any inherently feminine feature, this would accord with the supreme place which this feature held in rites (Dionysian) to which we have yet to refer.

CHAPTER IV

THE FESTIVAL OF BOOTHS OF THE MONTH KISLEV

CHAPTER IV

THE FESTIVAL OF BOOTHS OF THE MONTH KISLEV

THE title which 2 M. gave Hanukkah, " Booths of the month Kislev " (i. 9 ; cf. i. 18), and the description of its celebration as for eight days' duration, " in the manner of Booths " with gladness and the carrying of branches (x. 6 f.), have caused the festival to be regarded as having been modelled on Booths from the beginning (*R.E.J.*, 1912, tome 63, M. Liber, p. 20 f. ; cf. p. 29), or as having in its course received the character of Booths and undergoing again further modification and change (Hochfeld). Examination of the similarities and differences of the two festivals exhibits both of them to have qualities in common, but makes it at the same time clear that we cannot speak of Hanukkah as being modelled on Booths.

Hanukkah bears a resemblance to Booths in four of its features—the eight days' duration, the singing of the Hallel, the carrying of branches, and the illuminations. The eight days allotted to the festival of Hanukkah are certainly the same in number as Booths possesses. It is possible that when the Jewish festival of Hanukkah began its history, whether it was an entirely new creation of 164 B.C., or had its roots in popular customs performed at the season of the year in which the festival is set, or in some Hellenistic festival of a more definite kind, the duration of the festival may have been fixed in accordance with some festival precedent and the eight days of Booths supplied the pattern. On the other hand, the requirement that the altar before being used for public sacrifices should undergo seven days' cleansing by way of atonement may also claim to have had determining influence on the number of the festival days (Hamburger, "Weihfest," *R.E. für Bibel und Talmud*). Thereby the festival would be connected by an inherent element with the Hanukkah of the House. Before the reinstitution of the altar could take place there is little doubt that the cultus demanded the proper ritual. 1 M. testifies to the care with which the smaller heathen altar on the altar of burnt-offering was, as "stones of defilement," carried to an unclean place, and that even the stones of the great altar itself, as profaned, were put in a convenient place till a prophet should decide concerning them (1 M. iv. 44 f.). It is, therefore, equally probable that the number of days of Hanukkah has its origin in the sphere of ritual conception. To this has to be added that Jewish tradition does not show itself conscious of the duration of Hanukkah being after the model of Booths. The scholion of Meg. Taʿan. ix. explicitly asks why it is that the Hanukkah which Moses celebrated in the wilderness was seven days, and the Hanukkah of Solomon's time was seven days, while the festival of Hanukkah is eight days in length. The answer which is given is, that the Hasmoneans on coming to the temple built the altar, prepared it and the sacred vessels for the service, "and were occupied thereby eight days."[1] Here, as also in the story of the vase of oil, there is no knowledge of the eight days of Booths having been the pattern for the eight days of Hanukkah. The comparison which the author of 2 M. makes between Hanukkah and Booths when he states, in reference to the latter festival, "and Solomon kept the eight days" (ii. 12) finds not the faintest echo. The question which Meg. Taʿan. ix. puts appears almost pointedly at variance with this idea of the author of 2 M. M. Liber seeks to defend the position that Hanukkah was from the beginning modelled on Booths by regarding the latter festival as having the special character of a festival of inauguration.[1] At the institution of Solomon's temple (1 Kings viii.; 2 Chron. vii.) Booths is celebrated. Again, in Ezra iii. 1–6, after the Exile, the altar is set up in the seventh month and the feast of Booths is held. But Liber, by a strange accident, does not inform us that in Ezra vi. 16 f. upon the Hanukkah of the second temple, it is the festival of the Passover and Unleavened Bread which completes the proceedings with joy. Booths then has not the particular character of a festival of institution, and Hanukkah can owe nothing to it in this aspect.

---

[1] Meg. Taʿan. ix. : ובנו את המזבח ושרוהו בשיד ותקנו בו כלי שרת והיו מתעסקים בו שמונה ימים. Cf. Strack und Billerbeck, Bd. ii. p. 540 : "Diesen acht Tagen entsprechen also die acht Tage der Weihe."

On Hanukkah and on Booths the Hallel (Ps. cxiii.–cxviii.) is sung. But these psalms are also sung at Passover and Pentecost. It has been thought by Grätz (Grätz, *Psalmenkommentar*, p. 606: cf. Hochfeld, *ut sup.*, p. 482; Liber, *ut sup.*, p. 25) that this custom of singing this group of psalms at festivals was gifted by Hanukkah, the youngest festival, to the three great and older ones. Also Robertson Smith (*O.T. in Jewish Church*, p. 211) holds that Ps. xxx., "the song for the Hanukkah of the House," and the Hallel were used at the festival of the institution, by Judas, of the temple-service, and that "there is every reason to think that the Hallel, which, especially in its closing part, contains allusions that fit no other time so well, was first arranged for the same ceremony" (cf. Briggs, *Psalms*, Ps. cxviii.). But apart from this literary question, the use of the Hallel on great occasions of religious gladness, besides on Hanukkah and Booths, permits of no conclusions being made as to the relationship of Hanukkah to Booths. Hanukkah in its own rights was a festival of joy, of hymns and music (1 M. iv. 54), and as a season of gladness was, with Purim, carefully safeguarded from being encroached upon (Meg. Taʿan. ix.; *Mishnah*, Taʿan. ii. 8–10).

---

[1] "Hanoucca et Souccot," *R.E.J.*, 1912, tome 63, pp. 24, 25: "Hanoucca est la fête de la Dédicace du Temple. N'est-ce pas aussi le caractère de celle qui a reçu le nom de Souccot ?" "Entre Souccot et Hanoucca le lien, est le Temple ; les deux fêtes sont des fêtes de Dédicace, des fêtes du Temple."

The carrying of branches, a feature of the festival of Hanukkah, which possibly in Jason's history was remarked upon as "after the manner of Booths," is common to both festivals. It is improbable that in the winter month of Kislev there was ever any erection of booths to dwell in. From the description of the festival of Booths in Neh. viii. 13 f., we perceive that Ezra's Law-book contained the Torah of this festival (Lev. xxiii. 39–42), and that the ordinance (Lev. xxiii. 40), "Ye shall take you on the first day the fruit of goodly trees, fronds of palm trees, and boughs of thick trees, and willows of the brook" is taken as intending the erection of booths (Neh. viii. 15). The first indication of the rite of carrying the branches in the hand at Booths is given by the Book of Jubilees (135–104 B.C.), for the author of which the festival of the seventh month dates from the time of Abraham who "built booths for himself and for his servants on this festival" (xvi. 21), and "took branches of palm trees and the fruit of goodly trees, and every day going round the altar with the branches . . . gave thanks to his God" (xvi. 31). As the Book of Jubilees is the first witness for the ritual carrying of branches, it is the sole witness for the practice of the people setting "wreaths upon their heads" at Booths (cf. Charles, *Apoc.*, vol. ii. to Jub. xvi. 30, note). Now the lateness of literary evidence to the bearing of branches in the hands may be only accidental. But if between the time of the incidents recorded in Neh. viii. 13 f., 432 B.C., and the Book of Jubilees there had arisen a change or development of custom in the use of the greenery at Booths, it may seem as possible that Booths borrowed from Hanukkah as that Hanukkah borrowed from Booths.[1] There also presents itself the other possibility that, independently of each other, both festivals have adopted the custom of bearing the branches from foreign rites, these rites not necessarily having reference to the same deity.[2]

In respect of the carrying of branches at Hanukkah, the description in 2 M. x. 6 f. may not be regarded as intending altogether the same ceremony as performed at Booths. In this rite there is undoubted resemblance to the Jewish festival of Booths. But how much of religious practice and custom can be covered by the phrase which 2 M. employs, *σκηνωμάτων τρόπον*, may be judged from an inscription in the island of Kos and dating probably from the second century B.C., which, enumerating the sacred actions obligatory on worshippers on one of the great panegyric festivals, includes that of

---

[1] See Gray, *Sacrifice in the O.T.*, p. 295: "As against the significances of the later similarity of the observance of the Hanukkah and the feast of Booths, the possibility must be allowed of an increasing assimilation and an original greater diversity: to such increasing similarity it is possible that the present and Talmudic ritual of the *lulab* at the feast of Booths is due." Cf. p. 293.

[2] Cf. Gressmann, "The Mysteries of Adonis and the Feast of Tabernacles," *Expositor*, 1925, ix. vol. iii. p. 416 f. The procession with lulabs at Booths, Gressmann connects with the vegetation rites of the Baal religion, and in particular derives the Feast of Tabernacles (the booths) from an Adonis festival in Canaan, in the earlier period before the Exile.

"erecting booths" (*σκανοπαγείσθων*).[1] The expression *ἑορτὴ* (*τῆς*) *σκηνοπηγίας* (or *τῶν σκηνῶν*), by which the LXX translated "sukkoth," had already, according to Deissmann, in the world outside Judaism, the word *σκηνοπηγεῖσθαι* and its technical religious application to found upon. Much more evidently does the bearing branches and foliage open upon a wide field of religious practice.

Another factor affecting the question of the relationship of the two festivals concerned may here be brought under consideration. One festival, it may be urged, may well model upon another without taking over everything from its pattern. That Hanukkah of Kislev would repeat from Booths, for example, the latter's ritual of the water-drawing and the water-libation, actions pervaded by a sort of sympathetic magic and expressing expectancy of the early rains in the seventh month, seems hardly credible. Yet Hanukkah has been regarded as having been, for a period, celebrated exactly as Booths. But a great differentiation between the two festivals comes to light when we view the sacrificial system in which the Hebrew festivals had their place, and in which, if Hanukkah had been a true compensation for Booths from the priestly standpoint, we would certainly expect the prescriptions to be the same for both. The statement of 1 M. iv. 56, "they offered burnt-offerings with gladness and sacrificed a sacrifice of deliverance and praise," appears to signify, as Dr. Buchanan Gray (*ut sup.*, p. 290) points out, "not offerings special to the feast, but the burnt-offerings of the daily offering together with the additional offerings for the Sabbath and new moon which fell within the days of the festival." These sacrifices are specially referred to as offered with joy because they had been interrupted by the period of the persecution (2 M. x. 1 f.). But Josephus (*Ant.* xii. 7. 7) describes the festival more significantly in its sacrificial character. It was an occasion on which "Judas with his fellow-citizens celebrated with a feast the restoration of the temple-sacrifices, omitting no form of pleasure and feasting them on the sacrifices, which were many and splendid," that is, on animals slain as peace-offerings. Now at Unleavened Bread and Booths the law is (Num. xxviii.–xxix.) that, besides the ordinary daily burnt-offering (xxviii. 23 f.) and the usual peace-offerings (xxix. 39), additional offerings are to be made of animals not to be eaten by the people, but to be burnt-offerings and Haṭṭath-offerings. There is no evidence of additional offerings of this kind at Hanukkah. Josephus' description suggests that this festival was in an entirely different sacrificial class. Against this impression and this view represented by Gray, it may be said that it does not lie within the purpose of Josephus to describe the sacrificial features of Hanukkah in fullest detail, and that to do so would not accord with his method. Josephus tells, for example (*Ant.* xiii. 10. 6), the anecdote of Jannæus being pelted with citrons at the festival of Booths, and yet omits the main point of the story, which is, that Jannæus incurred the people's wrath by pouring the sacred libation on the ground (cf. b. Sukkah 48b). It is his manner not to discover specific Jewish customs to his heathen readers (cf. Hölscher, *Der Saduzäismus*, p. 88). In the tradition about Jannæus, Josephus passes over in silence an element of the temple-cultus. In his account of the sacrifices at Hanukkah it might also be supposed that he has made a similar, more excusable, omission. But the fact that when the Jewish sacrificial system came to an end in A.D. 70, and the additional sacrifices of the temple-cultus found their substitute in the additional (Musaph) prayers of the liturgy, no Musaph was introduced for Hanukkah, endows Josephus' narrative of the sacrificial character of Hanukkah with a significance which otherwise we might not be entitled to admit for it. We may therefore here infer a constitutional dissimilarity between Hanukkah and Booths, which speaks strongly against the latter being considered as the parent of the younger festival. This conclusion is further borne out by the information that under the Romans, till the arrival of Vitellius in Judea, the vestments of the high-priest were kept in the custody of the civil power in the Antonia, whence they were officially delivered to the high-priest on four annual occasions, "the three yearly festivals and on the fast day" (Jos. *Ant.* xviii. 4. 3; cf. xx. 1. 1), by which we must understand Passover, Pentecost, Booths, and the Day of Atonement. Thus here also in respect of the functions of the high-priest and the requirements of the temple-cultus, Hanukkah is plainly differentiated from the festival of Tishri.

---

[1] Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten*, 1909, pp. 81, 82. Cf. Anm. 3. J. Toepffer gives: "Zahlreiche heidnische Belege für den Brauch, bei religiösen Festen Hütten zu errichten."

The resemblance of Booths and Hanukkah as festivals of illumination is one which is bounded only by this general description. The illumination at Booths is of the women's court of the temple, a temple-illumination *par excellence*, and that of Hanukkah is connected with the household (*häusliche Festsitte*, Dalman, "Synagogaler Gottesdienst," *R.E. für Prot. Theol. und Kirche*, 1899). Krauss, who supposed a deliberate ordinance of the scribes changing the illumination at Booths to the lamp at Hanukkah, seemed to perceive that the idea, for which Hochfeld stands, that the household custom gradually rose out of the temple custom, was highly unnatural. Even Liber, who regards Hanukkah as a created festival, a second Booths or "contrefaçon de Souccot," thinks that the change of the temple illuminations to those of the houses was favoured by some popular rite ("une transposition favorisée par quelque rite populaire," p. 26). Ewald thought of the lighting of winter-solstice fires as the origin of the Hanukkah-lamp. These suppositions arise from the correct perception that the rite of the lamp cannot be derived from the illuminations at Booths.

When regard is taken to the ritual of Booths, it appears more clearly that the lights of Booths and Hanukkah are of disparate origin. The Mishnah-tractate Sukkah, on which we may rely as handing down to us the cherished tradition of the temple-cultus on the occasion of the great pilgrimage,[1] tells us "there was not a court in Jerusalem that was not lit up by the light from the house of the water-drawing."[2] Priests had lit the huge candelabra there. As far as private enterprise at this public illumination was concerned, this is recorded also as taking place at the temple, and consisted in the bearing of torches. We are informed that "pious and active men sprang before them [the spectators] with burning torches in their hands."[3] Rabban Simeon ben Gamaliel's ability in juggling with these torches (אבוקות), throwing eight of them into the air and catching them one by one in their descent, made a lasting impression and gave him a foremost place among the "expert men" who on those joyous occasions delighted the onlookers.[1] Now if Hanukkah had simply been the child and offspring of Booths, the compensation for Booths, the torch would have been a more nearly related emblem for extra-temple celebrations than the Hanukkah-lamps (נרות), and much more suitable if we think of winter-solstice enjoyments and displays. If a modelling on Booths had been contemplated, we would have reason to expect it to take this form, rather than that of the household rite of placing a lamp at the door.

---

[1] Cf. Thackeray, *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship*, p. 62: "The vivid accounts which have survived clearly come from an eye-witness, though the written record dates from after 70 A.D., which put an end once for all to the ceremonies described."

[2] Suk. v. 3: ולא היה חצר בירושלים שאינה מאירה מאור בית השואבה.

[3] Suk. v. 4: חסידים ואנשי מעשה היו מרקדים לפניהם באבוקות של אור שבידיהם . . .

Further, among the particular ceremonies of Booths it is recorded that the priests at the temple-service, turning their faces from the east to the west, said, "Our fathers who were in this place turned their backs to the temple and their faces to the east, bowing themselves eastwards to the sun, but, as for us, our eyes are to Jah."[2] The supplanting and refining of a custom which had its origin in solar worship at the autumnal equinox, and which was found by a more reflective age to have too evident connexion with that worship, could scarcely come to clearer or more candid expression. This shows where the illuminations at Booths have their religious context, and that they go back to a remote origin. The water-libation "that the rains of the year may be blessed to you,"[3] the bearing of the "lulab," the illuminations, point to the idea of the festival being the promotion of the growth of vegetation at the period of the year when darkness commenced to increase and light to wane. The hypothesis of Edersheim therefore (*Life and Times of Jesus*, vol. ii. cap. xiv. p. 227), wrongly assuming the vase-story (Sab. 21, b) to mean that there was an annual illumination of the temple at Hanukkah in memory of the miracle, and that from this practice "the rite of the temple-illumination may have passed from the Feast of the 'Dedication' into the observances of that of 'Tabernacles,'" is untenable. The rites of Booths, rooted in the motives of securing water and light, are inherent in that ancient festival, and if the custom of illumination at Booths were changed to temple-illuminations, it is unlikely that this was borrowed from Hanukkah, even if this latter ever had possessed the feature it is supposed to have bestowed.

---

[1] Cf. Surenhusius, Mish. Suk., *op.* p. 260: "Tandem hic famosissimi istius Rabban Simeon fil. Gamielis artificium spectandum curavi qui octo faces in aeram emissas unam post alteram in descensu recipere poterat cum omnium spectatorum admiratione." Cf. also Bartenora's note, *ibid.*, Suk. v. 4.

[2] Suk. v. 4: הפכו פניהם למערב ואמרו אבותינו שהיו במקום הזה אחורונים אל היכל ופניהם קדמה והמה משתחוים קדמה לשמש ואנו ליה עינינו:

[3] Rosh-hash. 16, a. Cf. Gressmann, "Mysteries of Adonis and the Feast of Tabernacles," *Expositor*, 1925, 9th Series, vol. viii.; Thackeray (*ut sup.*), p. 64.

When the Epitomist, through whom we first meet with the interpretation of Hanukkah as Booths of the month of Kislev, speaks of "Booths and of the fire," thereby keeping two kinds of religious practices apart, offering for the light-symbol a very particular exposition, indication is given to us that, *in respect of illumination*, he was aware there was no modelling of Hanukkah on Booths and no comparison between the lamps of the festival of lights and the light-rites at Booths. Explanations of Hanukkah which conceive of it as modelled on Booths pass over the fact that festivals are spontaneous expressions. They can find entrance, gradually, where they once were not. Their original content can be moulded and modified. They survive because they are *in vita*. Thus the supposition that Hanukkah was, for the sake of having a festival, fashioned *ad hoc* by the transference to it of features that belong to another festival, patently introduces the artificial into a realm where it usually is not found. That the two festivals were of widely different character appears also from the circumstance that, as the *locus* of the lighting at Hanukkah was not the temple, neither was the celebration confined to Jerusalem.[1]

We are now compelled to view the festival of Hanukkah in the light of that process to which the older Jewish festivals were subject. The spring-festival of Unleavened Bread marked the beginning of the barley-harvest; that of Weeks, the offering of the first-fruits of the wheat-harvest, the end of the corn-harvest season. Booths celebrated the ingathering of the vintage and olives. Passover goes back to the early pastoral period, when a victim from the flock or herd (Deut. xvi. 2) or one of the flock (P, Ex. xii. 3 f.), as atoning spring-sacrifice for the family, was slain and eaten. Upon the agricultural Hebrew festivals which have their origin in the agricultural religion of Baal and were fraught with rites of the worship and cult of the Baalim, Jahvism in the course of its growth effects modification and change. The Deuteronomists, who remove from the sacred writings pagan and offensive elements, yield, by their work, testimony of the process of development that had been taking place within the Jahveh-religion. Upon this comes a new interpretation of the origins of the festivals. Historical association is declared for them by the Priestly Code. They become commemorative festivals. Passover becomes commemorative of the freedom from Egypt and the slaying of the first-born of the Egyptians; Unleavened Bread, of the bread eaten in haste and trepidation on the flight from Egypt; Booths, of the bowers in which the Hebrews dwelt in the desert. Weeks ultimately yields to the same theological interpretation and commemorates, though the significance is wanting in the O.T., the giving of the Law on Sinai. Even the great fast, the Day of Atonement, is furnished, by the Book of Jubilees, with historical circumstances to explain its origin, and recalls the mourning of Jacob on receiving news of the death of Joseph.

---

[1] Cf. Kamphausen, 2 M. i. 9 (Kautzsch, *Apok.*, Bd. i. p. 86): "Die ägyptischen Juden wurden schwerlich, als könnte das Fest nur an diesem einen Orte . . . richtig begangen werden, nach Jerusalem eingeladen, sondern nur zur Mitfeier des Festes ermahnt" (*i.e.* as against Grimm).

Now if any festival seems to have its origin in a definite political situation, this is Hanukkah. The Maccabean revolt, the Hanukkah of the House, from which the festival's very name is derived, seem to be the historic causes which brought the festival to birth. It is therefore the more remarkable that 2 M., possibly the Jasonic source of 2 M., in explanation of Hanukkah, resorts to the traditional theological method of interpretation. After the pattern-explanation presented by the Priestly Code, of Unleavened Bread and Booths, the festival of Hanukkah is commemorative of the hard conditions through which the liberators of the nation had passed—a memorial (*μνημονεύοντες*, x. 6.) of their having spent their lives in caves and on the mountains like wild animals, and thus compelled to forgo the celebration of the joyous festival of Booths. The threads with which the author of 2 M. weaves his account are very diverse in nature. Hanukkah is commemorative of the renewal of the sacred fire, of the cleansing of the Holy Place, a commemoration of the hard times in the mountains, a commemoration of the omission of the celebration of Booths. Further, it has to be added that in both 1 and 2 M. there can be observed a shaping of history. Their statements (1 M. i. 54 f., iv. 52 f.; 2 M. x. 5), which place both the desecration and the Hanukkah of the House in Kislev, are to be looked upon in the light of the desire to fit the great happenings of the time into a divinely inspired providential system.

For, according to Daniel, the defilement of the temple and the cessation of the sacrifice occurred in midsummer, and there is little doubt as to which is the more trustworthy evidence.[1] Even in this chronological detail we see the method of adaptation and adjustment in a theological interest. We are thus led to investigate whether Hanukkah has undergone the same experience as other Hebrew festivals, of being cleansed of pagan elements, and then given a character commemorative of an historical event. We must ask if Hanukkah, in its distinctive features, is not best explained by the view that it is a festival which had entered into Judaism of the pre-Maccabean age, ripe for penetration by elements of Hellenistic religion, a festival which had taken too firm root to be eradicated from popular practice, but could be rendered innocuous, reinterpreted, and judaized.

Wellhausen (*Nachr. v. d. Gesch. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen*, 1905, p. 131), writing on the historical value of 2 M. in relation to 1 M., and comparing their accounts of the period they describe, detects as one feature of the festival which was converted into the festival of Hanukkah, a festival of Dionysus. The " unintelligible statement of 1 M. i. 58 " that the Israelites in the cities were forcibly dealt with month by month (ἐν παντὶ μηνὶ καὶ μηνί), he points out, receives its explanation by 2 M. vi. 7, recording that the Jews were compelled every month (cf. Schürer, *Z.N.T.W.*, 1901, p. 48 f.) to celebrate the king's birthday at a sacrificial banquet. He also shows that the statement which directly follows thereon in 1 M. (i. 59) regarding the yearly festival on the 25th Kislev (according to Wellhausen = 25th December) which the Jews were compelled to keep, follows also in 2 M. vi. 7, with omission of the date, but with the more precise definition of the festival as *Διονυσίων ἑορτῆς*, in which a procession with ivy wreaths, *κισσοί*, took place. “There thus comes to light,” he says, “the original nature of the festival of 25th December, which in accord with 1 M. i. 51 and 2 M. vi. 1, had in reality been introduced by the heathen. The Jews regarded it afterwards as commemorative of the Hanukkah, the cleansing of the temple after its desecration by the heathen, and of the restoration of the legitimate cultus. But this historical occasion was only later attached to the festival of 25th December to legalize this, and to judaize it.”[1] More particularly this festival of 25th Kislev was, he continues, “a nature-festival of the winter-solstice and had first found entrance to Jerusalem through the heathen, as a Dionysus-celebration, and thereafter had not been abolished, but had been rendered harmless through reinterpretation.”[2] He then proceeds to say that in Petra, the 25th of December was the festival of Dusares, that Dusares was called by the Greeks Dionysus, and that it may be doubted if the Dionysus of the Jerusalem festival of 25th Kislev was strictly differentiated from the Zeus Olympius (2 M. vi. 2) of the hellenized temple-cultus. The "Lord of Heaven" (Bel-semin), he states, is a name applicable to both deities, and on the other hand could be regarded as the equivalent of the "God of Heaven," as the Jews of that time named their ancient Jahveh. "The native speech was not suppressed in Jerusalem, and there people would speak neither of Dionysus nor of Zeus Olympius but presumably just of Bel-semin."[1]

---

[1] The murder of Onias (Dan. ix. 26) was at the beginning of the year-week which ended with the reinstitution of the cultus in Kislev 164. We have thus the data (*a*) from death of " the Anointed " (Onias) to the abolition of the Jewish cultus = half year-week = Kislev 171 to Sivan 167; (*b*) cessation of the cultus and defilement of the altar to the end of the second half year-week (3½ years; Dan xii. 7 = 1290 days, Dan. xii. 11), Tammuz 167 (midsummer) to Kislev 164. Cf. Meyer, E., *Ursprung, usw.*, Bd. ii. p. 150, Anm. i. and pp. 159, 160. Meyer (p. 160) terms 1 Maccabees' and 2 Maccabees' report *re* date of defilement of temple coinciding with that of the Hanukkah of the House " offenbar eine ungeschichtliche Mache."

---

[1] *Loc. cit.*: “Daraus erhellt das ursprüngliche Wesen des Festes am 25. Dezember, das nach 1 M. i. 51 und 2 M. vi. 1, eigentlich von den Heiden eingeführt war. Die Juden betrachteten es später als Memorie der Chanukka, der Reinigung des Tempels nach seiner Entweihung durch die Heiden und der Wiederaufnahme des legitimen Kultus. Aber dieser historische Anlass wurde dem Feste des 25. Dezember erst nachträglich untergelegt, um es dadurch zu legitimieren und zu judaisieren.”

[2] *Ad loc.*: “Es war vielmehr eigentlich ein Naturfest der Wintersonnenwende, das zunächst durch die Heiden, als Dionysusfeier in Jerusalem Eingang fand und hiernach nicht abgeschafft, sondern durch Umdeutung entgiftet wurde—Ob der Dionysus, zu dessen Ehren die jerusalemische Feier eingerichtet wurde, von dem Zeus Olympus (2 M. vi. 2) so sehr verschieden war, kann bezweifelt werden. Der Herr des Himmels entspricht so wohl diesem wie jenem, konnte andrerseits auch als Aequivalent des Gottes des Himmels gelten——”

This combination, which Wellhausen makes of 1 M. i. 59 and 2 M. vi. 7, and which, he holds, gives the fuller representation of events, Kolbe (*Beitr. zur syrisch. und jüdisch. Gesch.*, p. 138) ranges among other instances where a like comparison of the two works leads to the necessity of seeing behind them a common source.[2] But without the aid of this literary hypothesis as to the relationship of 1 and 2 M., Wellhausen's conclusion, which he bases almost entirely upon this combination of passages, that a Dionysian festival is the origin of Hanukkah, finds support in the data which 2 M. itself offers concerning Hanukkah in one of its aspects. And if it be admitted that the reading together of 1 M. i. 59 and 2 M. vi. 7 gives the correct description of the heathen festival held on 25th Kislev, then the language elsewhere with which 2 M describes Hanukkah must of necessity be viewed in a completely new light.

---

[1] "Man sagte dort weder Dionysus noch Zeus Olympius sondern vermutlich eben Bel-semin."

[2] Cf. Chapter I. (p. 19 f.). Kolbe, p. 138, says of the equation 1 M. i. 59 = 2 M. vi. 7b: "Jedes von ihnen (den beiden Büchern) gibt Fragmente deren Zusammensetzung erst ein Bild von der ursprünglichen Darstellung ermöglicht."

The account, which 2 M. x. 6–7 presents, of the festival as held on the first occasion after the institution of the temple-service, and previous to the decision to make the celebration annual, is the following: "And with gladness they celebrated eight days like Booths, remembering how (*μνημονεύοντες ὡς*) not long before, they had spent (their lives) during the festival of Booths (*τὴν τῶν σκηνῶν ἑορτήν*), in the mountains and in the caves like wild beasts. Therefore bearing thyrsus-staffs and beautiful branches, and also palms, they offered hymns of praise to Him who had prospered the cleansing of His Holy Place."[1] This statement seems to intend that the Jews in revolt had been refugees in the mountains and caves at the season of the festival of Booths and that therefore (*διό*) they now kept Hanukkah in the manner represented. Now this interpretation of Hanukkah depends solely on the two phrases "remembering," and "during the festival of Booths." In these two phrases making the festival *commemorative* of Booths we have reason to see the familiar method of the Priestly Code, and the working-over by the Epitomist, who, in his procemium, also makes the "fire" of Hanukkah commemorative of Nehemiah's action, of a much simpler statement of Jason. Jason himself had possibly described the festival as "in the manner of Booths" (*σκηνωμάτων τρόπον*). But if we omit the two phrases that bear the suspicion of being from the pen of the Epitomist, Jason's report of the proceedings must be regarded as consisting of the observation—"and with gladness they celebrated eight days in the manner of Booths, (days) which but shortly before (*i.e.* under Syrian rule) they had been accustomed to spend in the mountains and in the caves in the guise of wild animals (*θηρίων τρόπον*). Wherefore bearing thyrsus-staffs and beautiful branches and also palms they (now) offered hymns of praise to Him who had prospered the cleansing of 'His Holy Place.'" In 2 M. ii. 29, the Epitomist declares it as his intention to touch up, to inlay, or to renovate (*ἐνκαινίζειν*) Jason's work. In i. 12 f., the account of Epiphanes' death, which is inconsistent with the other (Jasonic, cf. Kolbe, p. 120) narrative of the same event (cap. ix.), the Epitomist's inlaying has been of a rough kind. But 2 M. x. 6–7 also, as it has left his hand, has every semblance of presenting a forced and artificial reason for Hanukkah, and of containing an interpretation superimposed on what had been a description of the character of the festival by Jason, who had openly revealed, in one respect at least, the festival's origin, and his satisfaction in the thought that the pagan festival-rejoicings were now turned to the praise of the God of Israel. Nor is the trace of the Epitomist's renovating only to be traced in the passage x. 1–7 itself, so crucial to him for his presentation of Hanukkah. But as by the legend of the "fire" in i. 18 f. he anticipated in order that he might interpret the scene of Judas procuring the sacred fire in x. 3, so also in v. 27, with a notice which contrasts (cf. Niese, p. 45, 46) with the historical picture drawn by 1 M. of the beginning of the revolt, he paves the way in anticipation for his interpretation of the Jasonic statement of x. 7 with a theologically inspired account of Judas and his companions living in the mountains like wild beasts (*θηρίων τρόπον*), feeding on herbs "in order that they might not be polluted like the rest."

---

[1] 2 M. x. 6–7: 6. *καὶ μετ᾽ εὐφροσύνης ἦγον ἡμέρας ὀκτὼ σκηνωμάτων τρόπον, μνημονεύοντες ὡς πρὸ μικροῦ χρόνου τὴν τῶν σκηνῶν ἑορτὴν ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν καὶ ἐν τοῖς σπηλαίοις θηρίων τρόπον ἦσαν νεμόμενοι.* 7. *διὸ θύρσους καὶ κλάδους ὡραίους, ἔτι δὲ καὶ φοίνικας ἔχοντες, ηὐχαρίστουν τῷ εὐοδώσαντι καθαρίσαι τὸν ἑαυτοῦ τόπον.* Moffatt (Charles, *Apoc.*, vol. i. p. 145) translates *ἦσαν νεμόμενοι* "had been wandering," *i.e.* on the hills; Kamphausen (Kautzsch, *Apok.*, vol. i. p. 106) renders "ihr Leben fristeten," *i.e.* "spent their life" (with an implication of hardship), but the Epitomist in 2 M. v. 27 wishes us to understand "maintained themselves" (fed) like wild animals. Latin "pasci"; cf. Liddell and Scott (*νέμω*).

The reference to life on the mountains (*ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν*) which the Epitomist's work has harnessed to the doctrine, strange in itself and not reciprocated by Jewish tradition, that Hanukkah was compensation for omission of another festival of another season, finds its natural context in those celebrations which Wellhausen's literary criticism of 1 and 2 M. discovers as the festival of 25th Kislev in pre-Maccabean times. The Dionysian revels had their special setting on the hill-slopes. In the only extant tragedy which depicts the picturesque ritual of the festivals of Dionysus, the *Bacchæ* of Euripides, we see Bromius leading the processions of worshippers from hill to hill (*Βρόμιος εὖτ' ἂν ἄγῃ θιάσους* || *εἰς ὄρος εἰς ὄρος*, line 115). "The cult of Dionysus consists, above all else, in celebrations on the mountains, on which the wild spirit of his male and female servants can have full vent" (Kern, "Dionysus," *P.-Wissowa*, Bd. v. col. 1010 f.).[1] For the country festivals of Dionysus, the *Διονύσια τὰ κατ' ἀργούς*, this would seem to be peculiarly appropriate; but also in "the great" or city-Dionysia (*μεγάλα* or *τὰ ἐν ἄστει*) in the month of Elaphebolion in Athens we find the place of the proceedings is the south slope of the Acropolis. In the "old" Athenian, whom 2 M. vi. 1 mentions as the king's commissioner in religious affairs, we may see the master of the festival ceremonies as performed at Jerusalem. But the revelries on Cithæron and Parnassus were the archetypes of the festival of Dionysus everywhere. Professor Tyrrell, in his Introduction to the *Bacchæ* of Euripides

[1] "Der D. Kult besteht vor allem aus Bergfeiern, in denen sich das wilde Wesen seiner Diener und Dienerinnen austoben kann."

(p. lxvi), speaks of the "intimate sense of mountains and mountain things" being maintained throughout the whole chorus (lines 64–169), and concentrated on the central figure. The God is "sweet upon the mountains" (ἁδὺς ἐν οὔρεσιν, line 135 f.), and for the worshippers of Dionysus, the practices and meaning of the cult are summarized as "mountain revelry with mystic lustrations" (ἐν ὄρεσσι βακχεύων ὁσίοις καθαρισμοῖσιν, lines 74–75). Even in the form in which 2 M. x. 6 is presented to us by the Epitomist, Hanukkah contained in its origin a memento of the time spent "in the mountains and in the caves in the manner of wild beasts." This further characterization brings to recollection features of Dionysian celebrations. There was the Corycian cave on Mount Parnassus, the scene of these revelries. There was "the Bacchic livery of dappled fawn-skins" (στικτά τ' ἐνδυτὰ νεβρίδων, Eur. *Bac.*, line 111) which the participators in the rejoicings wore. On Mount "Nysa where the wild beasts breed," and on Corycian heights, Dionysus is portrayed (*Bac.* 558 f.), thyrsus-staff in hand, leading his followers.[1] In Asia Minor the worship of Dionysus (Sabazius) united with that of Cybele (Kern, *ut sup.*, col. 1026), a goddess regarded as the divinity of mountains, caves, and haunts of wild animals, her very name the Phrygian word for caves. At Pessinus, the centre of her worship in Phrygia, a cave on Mount Dindymon contained her image.[2] By the likeness of the two cults we have to explain the fact that Cybele did not make the same concessions to the triumphal progress of Dionysus as Apollo had to make.[3] The participants in the Dionysian festival were clad *θηρίων τρόπον*, with animal skins (cf. Tyrrell, p. lxv, *ut sup.*). The worshippers of the Thracian Sabazius, as those of Dionysus in Macedonia, wore horns fixed upon their heads at their celebrations (cf. Rhode, *Psyche*, pp. 258, 269 note 19, *κερατοφοροῦσι κατὰ μίμησιν Διονύσου*, *Sch. Lyc.* 1237). The God himself is horned (*ταυροκέρωτι*, *Euphor.*, p. 14) and bull-shaped. His votaries are called *βουκόλοι*, "herdsmen," on inscriptions of Asia Minor and Thrace (*Ins. Perg.* ii. 485–488, Rhode, *ibid.*, p. 272, note 35). When the God descends to the shades to bring back his mother Semele, Cerberus recognizes him "aureo cornu decorum" (Hor. *Car.* II. xix. 29–32 in Bacchum).

---

[1] πόθι Νύσας ἄρα τᾶς θηροτρόφου θυρσοφορεῖς || θιάσους, ὦ Διόνυσ' ἢ κορυφαῖς κορυκιαῖς.

[2] Cf. art. "Cybele," *Ency. Brit.* ix.

[3] Col. 1026, Kern: "In Delphi musste Apollon dem neuen eingewanderten Gotte Concession machen. . . . In Kleinasien war das anders. Hier hatte der orgiastische Kult des μελάλη μήτηρ längst

Now Derenbourg reflects that besides the familiar formula "the wicked kingdom of Greece" (מלכות יון הרשעה), which has passed into Jewish writings and ritual as a memento of the days of Hellenic persecution, one other phrase has remained as the strongest expression of the tyranny of that time, namely, "Write on the horn of the ox that you renounce the God of Israel" (כתבו על קרן השור שאין לכם חלק באלהי ישראל). Derenbourg asks, "Why on the horn of the ox?"[1] Whatever the words may imply in respect of definite symbol and actions, there is no doubt they imply adoption of Hellenic religion, and there can be little doubt that the reference in particular is to the symbol of

---

alle Gemüter erobert . . . so tritt D. als Freund und Diener der Kybele in die kleinasiatische Religionsbewegung ein."

[1] *Essai*, p. 55, note 1: "מלכות יון הרשעה est une expression constante dans les ouvrages agadiques et a passé dans le rituel. On attribue aux Grecs seuls, dans leurs rapports avec les Juifs et comme la plus forte expression de leur persecution la locution suivante: כתבו, etc. . . . Pourquoi sur la corne d'un bœuf?" Cf. the remarkable prohibition Rosh-hash iii. 3, that all trumpets are legitimate except the horn of a cow, because it is a "קרן."

(כל השפרות כשרין חוץ משל פרה מפני שהוא קרן)

שור "has the general significance of an animal of the ox-kind" (Breslau, *Heb. Dic.*).

Dionysus as worn by his worshippers, by his "herdsmen."

The mention of the thyrsus-staffs (θύρσους) along with the beautiful branches and the palms (φοίνικας) in 2 M. x. 7 seems to purport that before the Epitomist's day the thyrsus had lost for Judaism its particular association with Dionysian festivals. The Epitomist in any case can leave the word as he had found it in Jason's work. Even Euripides in the *Bacchæ* (cf. Tyrrell, note to line 113) seems to draw no sharp distinction between the narthex or pith-wand and the thyrsus, the staff wound round with ivy and vine and with pine-cone on point. The term thyrsi might, therefore, characterize the willows [1] carried at the festival of Booths, provided reminiscence of its religious associations could be overcome or were lost. An examination, however, of the LXX renderings of Lev. xxiii. 40 and Neh. viii. 15, where the boughs of the various trees, as used at Booths, are described, makes the employment of the word "thyrsus" by the Epitomist, to whom Hanukkah is substitute for Booths and in whom a strong Pharisaic tendency has been observed, seem singular. The LXX does not employ the word. Josephus, in his *Antiquities* (iii. 10. 4, eiresiōne; xiii. 13. 5, thyrsi), also uses the terminology of the Dionysian festival in describing the branches used at Booths. Though Josephus is writing in A.D. 93 or 94 for Greek-Roman readers and to bring his race into favour with them, the parallel he provides for the use of the term "thyrsi" in 2 M., though this latter work is written for Jews and is almost two centuries earlier, may not lose all its value as evidence for the acceptance of such terms in Judaism, on account of Josephus' date, purpose, and personality. But the question is: When was the compromise made? Sculptural works in Syria and Palestine show how favoured were the symbols of Dionysus and how popular a divinity he was. But in contrast the ornamentation on ancient Jewish synagogues, which frequently exhibits the palm, never displays ivy.[1] In light of this temerity and conscious abstention, the statement of 2 M. x. 7 as to the ritual of Hanukkah is peculiar. That the word thyrsus could lose its strict connotation is very probable. But it could no more shed every vestige of its original connexions, in the minds of Jews, than it can for us to-day. The explanation of its appearance in 2 M. can only be that the writer can interpret Hanukkah for his readers as being "Booths" of Kislev, but he cannot change the practices as in his day performed or call the staffs by other names than they were in his time called by the celebrators. He can inlay; but here it would have been pointless to delete. He can impose his own individual doctrine of substitution for Booths on Jason's words. The compromise which the term thyrsus represents, we must conclude, was effected by the festival of Hanukkah itself and prepared for by the antecedents of that festival. For this acceptance by Judaism no other period is so suitable. The context of the word in 2 M. leads us to this time.

---

[1] 2 M. x. 7 distinguishes the thyrsi from the palms, as also does Jos. *Ant.* iii. 10. 4 the εἰρεσιώνη from the palm (and therefore from the "lulab" in either of its definitions). For εἰρεσιώνη, festival branch, used at Dionysian Thargelia, cf. Novack, *Lehrbuch d. Heb. Arch.*, Bd. ii. p. 182 note 1; Strack und Billerbeck, *Komm. z. N.T. aus Talmud und Midrasch*, Bd. ii. p. 780 f.

If, as 2 M. vi. 7 allows to infer, the heathen festival of 25th of Kislev had, as one of its main features, a procession with *κισσοί*, in honour of Dionysus, an analogy can be drawn in respect of the title which the Hebrew festival was given. Hochfeld (*Z.A.W.*, p. 281 f.) urges that Hanukkah cannot have had the origin which Wellhausen supposes, because names are usually kept when festivals are taken over and reinterpreted. As example, Hochfeld tenders "Purim." Krauss (*La Fête de Hanoucca, ut sup.*, p. 24 f.), however, notes that in Greek writings the name "Hanukkah" does not appear, though Greek transcriptions of the other festivals Pesach, Sukkoth, and Purim are frequent. Even the Greek equivalent *ἐνκαινισμός* does not appear till, after a lapse of nearly three centuries from the restoration of the Jewish cultus, it is met with in the *τὰ ἐνκαίνια* of St. John x. 22. The first mention of the name "Hanukkah" is in the Aramaic of the festival-chronicle Meg. Taʿan. ix. In the attachment of the festival to the event of the re-institution of the temple-service Krauss perceives Pharisaic influence, and says that we may conclude that the name was not known to Hellenist Jews, and not only the name but the idea, at least in the earlier time.

---

[1] Cf. Meyer, *Ursprung*, Bd. ii. p. 160, note 3: "Die Skulpturen Syriens und Palästinas zeigen bekanntlich, wie populär auch hier Dionysus (der unter anderem auch mit dem nabataeischen Gott Dhu-šarâj identifiziert wurde) und seine Symbole gewesen sind. Bei den jüdischen Synagogen dagegen (Kohl und Watzinger, *Antike Synagogen in Galilaea*, 29. *Veröffent. der deutsch. Orientges.* 1915) fehlt der Epheu natürlich, während die Palme gern verwendet wird."

We do not seem to be entitled to conclude from the absence of reference to our festival that the name Hanukkah or its equivalent in Greek did not attach to it from the first. Lack of reference to this festival must be due in large measure to its not possessing the Biblical authority the others had. The original Hebrew of 1 M. iv. 59 (cf. iv. 56), reporting the official ordinance concerning the celebration of the festival, would certainly call the festival ימי חנכת המזבח (*ἡμέραι ἐγκαινισμοῦ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου*), and this evidence cannot be set aside. The plan of making the festival commemorate the renewal of the temple-worship has, both theologically and politically, its best setting in the days of Judas, and the conditions for the shaping of the festival were most suitable then. While, however, we have no reason to doubt that the term Hanukkah attaches to the festival as early as 164 B.C., 2 M.'s descriptions suggest that the body of conceptions which the new name comprised still possessed an alien character, and that the festival was popularly called another name. 2 M. i. 9 does not ask the Egyptian Jews to observe the *enkainismos* or Hanukkah of the altar, but "the days of Booths of the month Kislev." In 2 M. i. 18 the festival is a celebration of "the cleansing of the temple" (*katharismos*), and of "Booths and of the fire." 2 M. ii. 16 speaks of celebrating the "cleansing" and celebrating "the days." The edict (2 M. x. 8) decrees the keeping annually of "the ten days" (*τὰς δεκάτας ἡμέρας* A.: *δέκα* Ven.; cf. Swete LXX).[1] The language of 2 M., in the passages where there is opportunity of giving a title to the festival, seems to reveal that the celebrations were generally known either by the name "days of Kislev" or "Booths of Kislev." Now it was by the names of months that certain notable Hellenic festivals were called, or, as the connexion was so intimate, from the names of the festivals the months had anciently received their names (cf. Pyanepsia, and the Dionysian Anthesteria, Lenæa, and Dadophoria). The Anthesteria, the festival of flowers, the Lenæa, the festival of the wine-presses, give name of the month and the character of the celebration. If Wellhausen's derivation of Hanukkah is at all justified, we must look at the title "Booths of

---

[1] *ἄγειν τὰς δεκάτας ἡμέρας* seems to be not a phrase expressing a round number, but rather to have as parallel *τὴν δεκάτην* (sc. *ἡμέραν*) *θύειν* (cf. Liddell and Scott), to give *a naming day* feast—a child receiving its name the tenth day after birth. Cf. חניכה, "*the name given to the child* by the person rubbing its palate" with a chewed fig (Jastrow, *Talmud Dict.*).

Kislev" in relation to that origin. The title conforms to Hellenic pattern. "Skenopegia" (Booths), as Deissmann has shown, had other associations than Jewish. In an age of religious syncretism, in a period when among the Jews themselves there were zealous Hellenizers, no term was more suitable as medium of reconciliation between the old and the new. It is on the title "Booths of Kislev" the author of 2 M. later exercises the resources of his apologetic, interpreting it as "Booths" of Kislev, as a compensation for the festival of Tishri.

So far, the conclusion at which Wellhausen had arrived through textual criticism of 1 and 2 M., that in Hanukkah we have the reinterpretation and supplanting of a festival of Dionysus, finds support. 2 M., whose religious interests are more prominent than those of 1 M., has preserved the historical situation in this sphere more faithfully, and in spite of his own theological interpretations enables us to see something of the *ritus* of the original festival which Hanukkah inherited. In so far as Hanukkah was in respect of the bearing of branches in the "manner of Booths," it appears to have taken over, from the Dionysian procession of 25th Kislev, that element which Jewish tradition permitted it to assimilate. The general characterization, by the author of 1 M., of the festival as observed by hymns and music, fits into the picture. Dionysian origin, however, must be denied for that part of the practices at Hanukkah in virtue of which it was a festival of lights. It is just here it might be thought that such derivation might be affirmed. Professor Bury (*History of Greece*, p. 312) thus describes the celebrations in honour of the God in Bœotia and Attica: the worshippers "gathered at night on the mountains by torch-light, with deer-skins on their shoulders and long ivy-wreathed wands in their hands, and danced wildly to the noise of cymbals and flutes." Festivals of Dionysus were festivals of lights. The month Dadophorios (November or December) had its name from the torches that blazed in his celebrations and lit up the summit of Parnassus. The festival itself bore the title *Δᾳδοφόρια* (Dittenberger, *Syll.*, 2nd ed., p. 438; cf. Kern, "Dion.," *P.-Wissowa*). At the time when the torches of the Thyades, the women worshippers of the divinity, illuminated the hill, in honour of the newly born Dionysos "lichnites," the "Hosioi" held their service at his tomb. In the celebrations held at Athens on the 8th Elapheliolion (March), poets, actors, and choirs presented themselves in the Odeion to the people, and in a torch-light procession the image of Dionysus Eleuthereus was carried through the city. If then this carrying of lights was a feature of the Dionysian festivals, and if the festival of Hanukkah had origin at all in the practices of this cult, it might seem that we are prevented looking elsewhere for the derivation and meaning of the lights of Hanukkah. It does not appear that, except for his earlier opinion (*Isr. und jüd. Gesch.*, p. 210) in agreement with Ewald (*Gesch.*, iv. p. 407) that the date 25th Kislev signified the winter-solstice and thus a nature-festival with illuminations, Wellhausen had any reason for not regarding the Dionysian celebration itself as the origin of Hanukkah as festival of lights. His statement (*Nachr.*, 1905, p. 131) that the festival of 25th Kislev was "a nature-festival of the winter-solstice and had first found entrance . . . as a Dionysus-celebration" is a combination of the earlier and the later view.

We must here again represent that the author of 2 M. in his interpretation of Hanukkah as a festival of Booths, that is, where he is reinterpreting what was the Dionysian festival of pre-Hanukkah days, does not trace the light-symbol of Hanukkah to Booths. This is the more remarkable on account of what we must regard as the particular concern of the author to reveal Hanukkah as compensation for Booths, and because within the customs of Booths there was included illumination. In this aspect of the celebration, the festival of Booths with its lighting of torches (אבוקות) and the casting them in the air, was more akin to what we find in the Dionysian cult than to what was done at Hanukkah. This refusal to trace the light-symbol of Hanukkah to Booths seems, unless 2 M. is employing a calculated diversity of interpretation, to show that the origin of the Hanukkah-lamp is elsewhere than in the honours done Dionysus on 25th Kislev. Further, the torches of Booths, a festival once held at the "tekuphah" or turn of the year (1 Sam. i. 3, 10; cf. *Century Bible* and Ex. xxxiv. 22) at the time of the autumn-equinox, it may be supposed had originally solar significance; and after the festival was attached to the central sanctuary, their lighting there was still in public, in the open. The element of the Dionysia was the free spaces. The Hanukkah-lamp, it is true, may be the modification of a custom widely different from it; but ritual is usually retentive of traces of its origin in essentials and peculiarities, and we have to explain the lamp's connexion with the house and its place at the house-door. Open-air winter-solstice celebrations, especially when, as at Hanukkah, there was no tie binding to temple or city, are not easily domesticated. Two of the ritual features of Hanukkah find analogy in practices performed on other occasions besides Booths. Feasting was general to the great annual festivals, on which, in the language of Deuteronomy, the people came "to eat before Jahveh." Lamps were lit for the Sabbath, and the night of the Day of Atonement was celebrated by illumination (*Pesachim*, iv. 4). Josephus (*Cont. Ap.* ii. 9) speaks of his fellow-countrymen as "those who held such and so great lamp-festivals." Regarded conjointly, however, the partaking of good fare, the branches, the lights, all reminiscent of modes of celebrating Christmas, are features suggestive enough of possessing solstitial character. That all these three features, moreover, are common to Booths, whatever important differences between Hanukkah and Booths are to be observed in detail, might justly be adduced in favour of Hanukkah too being a festival celebrated at a turning-point in the sun's course. The general similarity of Booths and "Booths of Kislev" might be held at least to be sufficient to establish this as probability. But the theory which explains the lights of Hanukkah from a popular custom of lighting fires at the winter-solstice rests ultimately upon an assumption regarding the festival's date, and this assumption now requires examination.

Since Wähner's "de festo Encaeniorum judaico, origine nativitatis Christi" (1725), the attraction has proved very great to regard Hanukkah as the forerunner of Christmas. If the 25th of Kislev could be equated with the 25th of December, there would be a very high degree of probability that Hanukkah was a festival of lights of the winter-solstice, and some reason perhaps for connecting the Christian festival with Hanukkah. But we have been reminded recently that this equation made by Wellhausen, Ed. Meyer,[1] Ed. Norden,[2] and

---

[1] Meyer, *Ursprung*, Bd. ii. p. 209, note 5.

[2] Norden, *Die Geburt des Kindes*, p. 26: "Wellhausen hat mit Recht und unter Zustimmung Ed. Meyers betont, dass dieses Datum sich aus dem jüdischen Kultus unter keinen Umständen erklären lasse: die Wahl sei verständlich nur durch Anlehnung an ein heidnisches Wintersonnenfest, das 'entgiftet' worden sei, indem man es judaisierte."

R. Kittel,[1] and on which they base the belief that the Hanukkah-lights are a Jewish transformation of heathen winter-solstice illuminations, is not admissible. M. P. Nilsson (*Deut. Liter.-Zeitung*, N.F., 3. Jahrg. Heft 23; June 1926), with special knowledge of heortological and calendral data, states that these data have not been, by those writers, accurately enough weighed. Before Cæsar's reform of the calendar in 46 B.C., he points out, there was no calendar whose dates followed the sun; the Egyptian year was a variable year, and the lunisolar year of the Semitic and primitive peoples was either periodically or empirically regulated. The Jewish calendar was of this latter kind—every date in it moved, every year, in relation to the sun, eleven days backward, and was in every third or sometimes second year, by intercalation of a month of thirty or twenty-nine days, again moved forward. This marked and continual variation, in relation to the sun, of a day in a lunisolar year, prevents the equating of such a day with a day in the solar year. "It would be therefore absurd," he concludes, "to say that a day of a lunisolar month, *e.g.* the 25th Kislev, regularly coincided with that day in the sign of Capricorn on which the winter-solstice fell, that is the first." [2] Rough comparisons are necessary as a very inexact means of general representation, but unless their character as such is recognized, they are misleading, and completely so in respect of the time before the introduction of the Julian calendar. Therefore, "when from a rough equation of two months we then derive an equation of their series of days and make two particular days, such as the

---

[1] R. Kittel, *Die hellenist. Mysterienreligion und das A.T.*, 1924, p. 20.

[2] Nilsson, *ad loc.*: "Es wäre deshalb eine unglaubliche Behauptung zu sagen, dass ein Tag eines lunisolaren Monats z.B. der 25. Kislev, dem Tag im Zeichen des Steinbocks regelmässig gleichgesetzt wurde, auf den die Wintersonnenwende fiel, d.h. dem ersten."

25th Kislev and the 25th December, the same, our procedure is still more precarious."[1]

Wellhausen's comparison between Hanukkah of the 25th Kislev and the festival of Dusares (identified by the Greeks with Dionysus), held on the 25th December at Petra, has to be estimated in the light of the strictures which Nilsson has passed on the employment of the data of the calendar. The birthday of the god Dusares was indeed held in Petra, as that of Sol invictus in Rome, on the 25th December; but, as Cumont informs us, this was in the time of the Empire, when Dusares became a Sun-God, and therefore honoured by celebrations on the winter-solstice.[2] This being after the reform of the calendar, the analogy between the Dusares festival and Hanukkah is inapt as regards the date.

Considering that Hanukkah lasted eight days from the 25th of Kislev, and on the large assumption that in 164 B.C. this date fell on the solstice, it might seem that the festival would thereafter keep close enough to the shortest day of the year to suit the idea of the festival. But in a single Jewish year, when no intercalation was made, the eight days would be insufficient for this purpose. After all, a festival of the winter-solstice must keep the day of the solstice within its range, especially if the object be to transform, judaize, and render innocuous a popular heathen practice. But a fixed date in a lunisolar year would detach Hanukkah from the solstice celebrations, just as the fixing of the date of Booths later by the Priestly Code severed that festival from the autumn-equinox. In the case of Hanukkah the aim of separating it from the beginning from what it is supposed to supplant is possible, but in the circumstances unlikely. Nilsson, who says it is questionable if the Semitic peoples had any festivals which were not bound to the lunisolar calendar, but only to the course of the sun,[1] remarks expressly that he does not exclude the possibility of a connexion between the two festivals of "lights," Hanukkah and Christmas. But the hypothesis on which that connexion would rest, he says, would be tenuous, for it would have to be reduced to the statement—"Perhaps there was a festival of lights held at the solstice. This was taken over officially as Dedication-festival, and then, as it had to find place in the official lunisolar calendar, for some unknown reason, was transferred to the 25th of Kislev."[2]

---

[1] "Dass ferner aus dieser groben Vergleichung der Monate eine Vergleichung ihrer Tagesreihen hergeleitet wird d.h. der Vergleich zweier bestimmter Tage, z.B. 25. Kislev = 25. Dezember ist noch viel bedenklicher. Selbstverständlich dürfte es aber nach dem Gesagten sein, dass sie vollends in der Zeit vor der Einführung des julianischen Kalenders irreführend und unstatthaft ist."

[2] Cf. Cumont ("Dusares," in *P.-Wissowa*, 1905): "Am 25. Dez. wurde die Geburt des Gottes, wie in Rom der natalis Invicti, gefeiert und zwar durch nächtliche Orgien (Epiph. *adv. Hær*. 51. 22)." "In der Kaiserzeit wurde Dusares zu einem Sonnengott (Le Bas-Waddington, 23. 12, *Δουσάρεος ἀνικήτου*), daher wird er am 25. Dez. zur Zeit der Wintersonnenwende gefeiert."

The date of Hanukkah, attractive as it has proved, is powerless to invest the festival with the character of a winter-solstice celebration. The character also of the month of Kislev, as portrayed by Jewish tradition, may be seen (see Chapter VII.

---

[1] Cf. Gray, *Sacrifice in O.T.*, p. 298: "Solar influence combined with lunar influence to keep the two great agricultural festivals of the year (Unleavened Bread and Booths) to the time of the spring and autumn equinoxes; it *may* also, though this is doubtful, have originated a winter-solstitial festival which only survived transformed into an historical commemoration in the Roll of Fasting." Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 289, 297.

[2] "Dass vielleicht ein volkstümliches, an die Wintersonnenwende gebundenes Lichtfest bestanden hat und dass dieses als Tempelfest in offizielle Aufnahme kam und dann, da es in den offiziellen lunisolaren Kalender nunmehr eingereiht werden musste, aus irgend einem uns unbekannten Grunde auf den 25. Kislev verlegt wurde . . . Es ist aber ersichtlich, dass eine solche auf bescheidenere Masse reduzierte Hypothese viel von ihrer Zugkraft verliert und sehr unsicher ist."

below) to be more adverse to such a view of Hanukkah than favourable. In that aspect of Hanukkah in which it is described as Booths of Kislev, we have sought to show that the conclusion to which Wellhausen was led by his textual analysis of 1 and 2 M. is borne out by examination of 2 M. The festival which Hanukkah reformed, included rites in honour of Dionysus. But whether the heathen festival is sufficiently described by reference to this divinity remains to be considered. Hanukkah was the Jewish winter-festival (cf. St. John x. 22). The winter-season was specially appropriated to Dionysus (cf. Rhode, *Psyche*, p. 309, note 31). Then he was conceived to be on earth. The months Dadophorios (November or December) at Delphi, Poseidon (December) and Gamelion (January) in Athens, were occasions of his worship.

To the evidence which 2 M. yields, of the festival of Hanukkah transforming rites of Dionysus, may here be added testimony, which comes from two sources, that in the same century in which Hanukkah appears, in certain circles of Judaism a mingling of the two deities Jahveh and Dionysus (Sabazius) was effected. The festival of Hanukkah manifests an influence of the worship of Dionysus on Judaism only in so far as the latter found it necessary to suppress that influence by supplanting, and this is proof of the vitality of Judaism. Both 1 M. (i. 11) and 2 M. (ii.–iii.), however, show that within Judaism itself there was an influential Hellenizing party, promoters of Hellenization, the *ἄνομοι καὶ ἀσεβεῖς ἐξ Ἰσραήλ* (1 M. vii. 5 f.), who even after the success of the revolt complain to Demetrius that Judas and his party "have scattered us from our land." These were martyrs for their faith. We cannot suppose that the rise of the Maccabees caused these Hellenized Jews entirely to disappear, or that the movement of syncretism of religion which received check in Judah did not continue in the Judaism of the Diaspora. 1 M. xiv. 14 (cf. xiv. 36) speaks of Simon having "put away the Lawless and the wicked." This reveals the religious opposition with which orthodox Judaism was confronted in the homeland, and the method by which that difficulty had to be solved—banishment, or, if the reference of Meg. Taʿan. vi. (cf. Derenbourg, *Essai*, p. 69; Dalman, *Aram. Dialektproben*, p. 43) to 22nd Elul as a memorable day applies to this time, capital punishment.[1] The religious development which within the Judaism of Palestine had been thus arrested, we might naturally expect to continue elsewhere: for example, among the Jews in Asia Minor in particular, where Antiochus the Great (200 B.C.) had planted Jewish colonies (Lydia and Phrygia, Jos. *Ant.* xii. 3. 4) in the interest of his government. It is of this region Keil says that "Schürer and F. Cumont have made it appear probable that the cult of the Theos Hypsistos had, as its chiefest bearers in Asia Minor, the many settlements of Diaspora-Jews and their proselytes, organized in more or less paganized unions, and that under the name of the 'Highest' we have in reality to see concealed the name of the God of Israel."[2]

Schürer (*Sitzungsbericht d. könig. Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. zu Berlin*, 1897, p. 199 f.) has shown that in the Bosphoran kingdom, north of the Black Sea, there were at latest in the first century A.D. Jewish settlements, and, under Jewish influence, religious communities had been formed who worshipped Theos Hypsistos (*Θεῷ ὕψιστῳ παντοκράτωρι εὐλογητῷ*) as chief god, but beside him also Zeus, Gē, and Helios.[1] Inscriptions show a marked mingling of Jewish conceptions with those specifically heathen. The religious guilds that are found here in the third century A.D., and the Hypsistarii of Cappadocia of the fourth and fifth centuries, confirm the rise of a mixture of Jewish and heathen religion (Mischbildungen) with its central element the worship of the Theos Hypsistos or Highest God. Cumont (ὕψιστος in *Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll*), proceeding upon the results of Schürer's investigation, points to the great spread of the cult of Theos Hypsistos, as testified by inscriptions, in Asia Minor, in the centre as well as on the coast, and connects the fact with the existence of numerous Jewish colonies there (cf. Schürer, *Gesch.* iii. 12 f.). Here Cumont traces this commingling (Mischkult) of the Jewish Theos Hypsistos, the favourite title of Jahveh among Hellenized Jews, with such divinities as Hekate Soteira, Zeus, Helios, etc., to an earlier stage, and regards as especially important the Mysian Stele of the second century B.C. (Perdrizet, *Bull. Hell.* xxiii., 1899, p. 593) with its Bacchic relief, a monument of the worshippers of Zeus ὕψιστος, as evidence of a syncretism of Jahveh Sabaoth and Jupiter Sabazius, that is, of Judaism and the Thraco-Phrygian mysteries.[2]

---

[1] Meg. Taʿan. vi.: בעשרין ותרין ביה תבנא לקטלא רשיעיא.

[2] J. Keil, "Die Kulte Lydiens," p. 263 in *Anatolian Studies* (presented to Sir W. M. Ramsay), 1923 (ref. to Cumont, *Musée du cinquantenaire*, 67, n. 54): "und dass sich unter dem Namen des 'Höchsten' eigentlich der Gott Israels verbirgt."

---

[1] Cf. Schürer, *ibid.*, p. 204. Inscription, containing formula for freeing a slave by dedication to the proseuchē, from Gorgippia (Anapa), A.D. 41. The slave is free ὑπὸ Δία Γῆν Ἥλιον, and the action of freeing is in honour of Θεῶι ὕψ. κ.τ.λ. "Man kann kaum sagen, welches Element (jüdisch oder heidnisch) das Übergewicht gehabt habe in der Vorstellungswelt des Mannes, der sich dieser Ausdrucksweise bedient" (p. 206). Cf. Jewish-heathen inscription, p. 203, *ibid.*

[2] Cf. Cumont, *ad loc.*, who also refers to a dedication in Pirot in Serbia by a "Thiasos Sebazianos" (*Arch. Epig. Mitteil. aus Oest. Ungarn*, x., 1886, S. 238) to Θεῷ ἐπηκόῳ ὑψίστῳ, where the Hypsistos mentioned "ist also der phrygische Sabazius" (Schürer, *ut sup.*, p. 210 f.) as showing this syncretism. Cf. Cumont, *Les Mystères de Sabazius et le Judaisme*, 1906, p. 63; Reitzenstein, *Die Hellenis-*

In light of Cumont's conclusion of a mingling of Sabaoth and Sabazius, the often so-thought ill-informed reference of Valerius Maximus (i. 3. 2) to the Jews who were expelled from Rome in 139 B.C. as worshippers of Sabazius must be reviewed. The statement of Val. Maximus is preserved in two excerpts: (1) (Julius Paris)—idem Judæos, qui Sabazi Jovis cultu Romanos inficere mores conati erant, repetere domos suas coegit; and (2) (Nepotianus)—Judæos quoque, qui Romanis tradere sacra sua conati erant, idem Hispalus urbe exterminavit arasque privatas e publicis locis abiecit. According to this, the prætor peregrinus, Hispalus, ejected from Rome Jews who were worshippers of Sabazius and who possessed private altars, because they attempted propaganda. Schürer (*Gesch.* iii., 4th ed., p. 58) regards the statement in Val. Max. as without doubt resting upon a confusion (auf einer Verwechslung) of the Jewish Sabaoth and Sabazius in the mind of the author, and the expulsion-order to apply to some in the following of the embassy (not to the embassy itself) which Simon had sent in 139 B.C. to Rome. Schürer also takes account only of the words which the two excerpts have in common. But it would seem clear that we are hardly entitled to view these two excerpts otherwise than as supplementary of one another. The mention of private altars shows that the reference is not to any orthodox Judaism. This feature of the religion of these expelled Jews, as Reitzenstein (*Die Hellenist. Mysterienrel.*, 1927, p. 106) emphasizes,

tischen Myst. Rel., pp. 99 and 105. Eisele ("Sabazius," in *Roschers Lexikon d. griech. und röm. Myth.*, S. 263) states Cumont's position thus: "So hatten sich hier in (Lydien und Phrygien) auf der Unterlage sabazischer Thiasoi oder jüdischer Synagogen eine Reihe von Mischkulten gebildet die in der Verehrung des von den Juden selbst seit der alexandrinischen Zeit als Θεὸς ὕψιστος bezeichneten Jahveh ihren Mittelpunkt fanden. Der Κύριος Σαβαώθ der Septuaginta sei ein Äquivalent des allmächtigen heiligen Κύριος Σαβάζιος."

cannot be held to be an invention.[1] These altars, *aras privatas e publicis locis*, are certainly to be connected with those "at the doors of houses and in the streets" (1 M. i. 55), to the offerings upon which the author of 1 M. gives prominence, as a custom and mark of Hellenism in the days of Antiochus Epiphanes. To this practice our next chapter must refer. If we unite, as Schürer does, the two events, the expulsion of the Jews from Rome in 139 B.C. and the appearance in the same year there of Simon's embassy, more likely than that trouble arose due to some of the retinue of the embassy seeking to make proselytes, is the suggestion of Reitzenstein, that it was in fact the Law-abiding, orthodox Jews from Jerusalem who drew the attention of the authorities to their hated Hellenized brethren.[2] These had identified their Sabaoth with the Thraco-Phrygian Sabazius, who also, in Asia, was equated with Dionysus. The prætor applies the law directed against the Bacchanalia to them. The two representations of Judaism had given rise to friction and conflict.

---

[1] Reitzenstein, p. 105: "Beide Auszüge (Julius Paris, Nepotianus) ergänzen sich gegenseitig, p. 106, Anm. 1. Ganz verfehlt ist es, diese Gleichsetzung (Jahve und des Dionysus) der Willkür späterer Philosophen zuzuschreiben, wie dies Ganschinietz (*Realencyklopädie*, ix. 715) oder einem törichten Missverständniss späterer Autoren wie dies Schürer a.a.O. annimmt. Wen sollten wir auch dafür verantwortlich machen? Livius wäre ausgeschlossen; er hat den Gott der Juden anders betrachtet (Norden, *Agnostos Theos*, S. 59 f.). Für Valerius oder Julius Paris wäre es mindestens seltsam und durchaus unwahrscheinlich; auch müssten wir dann annehmen, dass Nepotianus die Angabe über die Altäre erfunden hat. Lehnen wir das ab, so fällt die ganze Annahme dahin, dass die Gesandtschaft des makkabäischen Hohenpriesters Simon oder . . . Leute aus ihrem Gefolge in Rom Proselyten gemacht haben, und daher ausgewiesen seien und damit die Behauptung Meyers, die Judengemeinde Roms sei im Jahre 139 entstanden. Sie ist älter und geht von dem hellenisierten Diaspora-Judentum aus."

[2] Reitzenstein, *ibid.*, p. 107, Anm.: "Das zeitliche Zusammentreffen der nationaljüdischen Gesandtschaft und der Austreibung der hellenistischen missionierenden Kaufleute kann höchstens die Annahme nahe legen, dass gerade jene gesetzesstrengen Männer darauf aufmerksam machten, dass es sich hier nicht um einen echten Volkskult, sondern um eine hassenswerte Mischbildung und Neuerung handle."

In the time of Simon, the battle of principles which had been waged between Judaism and Hellenism was now over. When Simon is assassinated by his son-in-law Ptolemæus, the nation withstands the shock and the struggle that ensued. "These events show," states Meyer, "that Jonathan and Simon had thoroughly uprooted the opposition, and that therefore among the people there was little desire any more for attachment to the Seleucids."[1] In the territory over which Simon ruled, Judaism had won the day. There the reaction to Hellenization had taken place, and bore its own results. But in the Jewish settlements of Asia Minor the *epimixia* (cf. 2 M. xiv. 3, note in Kautzsch, *Apok.* i.), the mingling, continued. In Mysia, if Cumont is right, we see the mixed cult of Sabaoth and Sabazius, in which without doubt the similarity of names had played a part from the beginning, and which subsisted on the common foundation of the concept Hypsistos. In Rome we meet with adherents of this cult. To take this as evidence of influence of the Dionysus worship on Judaism depends upon the perspecitve from which the phenomenon is regarded. Emphasis must rather be placed on the fact that from Judaism there were separated shoots which brought forth the fruits of Hellenistic religion on congenial soil. Gressmann reminds us of the religious and historical importance of the "Halbjudentum," that stream of Judaism whose waters united with the current of the religions of the nations.[2] 1 and 2 M., though from an orthodox Jewish outlook which regards the Hellenized Jews as "wicked" or as almost no longer Jews, lead us to the critical point at which the movement of syncretism in Palestine was turned, and 2 M. permits us to see the purpose Hanukkah served in that turning and in the resisting of Hellenistic religion in an aspect in which the latter was perhaps above all the most alluring—its festivals.

---

[1] *Ursprung*, Bd. ii. p. 267.

[2] Cf. Gressmann, *Die Aufgaben der Wissenschaft des nachbiblischen Judentums*, 1925, p. 32.

CHAPTER V

THE ORIGIN OF HANUKKAH AS FESTIVAL OF LIGHTS

CHAPTER V

THE ORIGIN OF HANUKKAH AS FESTIVAL OF LIGHTS

PROFESSOR W. M. RAMSAY ("Religion of Greece," *H.B.D.*, extra vol., p. 124) observes that "ritual comes first and myth is secondary," even though "myth begins from the very origin of ritual and there was probably never a time when rite existed free from myth." It is this primacy of ritual we must keep before us in seeking to penetrate to the origin of the Hanukkah-lamp which the festival-legend of the sacred fire in 2 M. is the first clear indication of the attempt to explain and justify. "Illumination" and "lights" are general terms. They hide essential features of the ritual of the lamp, and give rise to the assumption that these are secondary. Also the belief that 25th Kislev represents the 25th of December, and that Hanukkah modified winter-solstice folk-customs, has contributed to a disregard of the ritual concerned. It is this latter which makes it highly improbable that the custom of the lamp developed from the bearing of torches at a Dionysian festival or from the lights at Booths. The Hanukkah-lamp was fixed at the outer door of the house. This undoubtedly was the ritual practice from the beginning of the Jewish festival. Whenever reference to the festival passes from the general to the explicit, the lamp and its place are seen to constitute the body and soul of the rite.

More akin in ritual to Hanukkah than the festivals just mentioned, more akin than the sun-fires of nature-festivals, is a festival recorded by Herodotus (bk. ii. § 62)—that in honour of the goddess Neith or Nith, whom Herodotus calls Athene, in Egypt. "When they are assembled at the sacrifice, in the city of Sais, they all on a certain night kindle a great number of lamps in the open air, around their houses; the lamps are flat vessels filled with salt and oil and the wick floats on the surface, and this burns all night; and the festival is thence named 'the lighting of lamps.'" This was done, the historian adds, throughout all Egypt, not only in Sais, but the "religious reason" the celebrants gave for it he refrains from communicating.[1] Similar, however, as the ritual here seems to be to that of the Hanukkah-lamp, it is different. Descriptions of the lights of Hanukkah as illumination of the façades of the houses are free and inexact. The casual, but for that very reason important, reference in *Mishnah*, Baba Qamma (vi. 6),[2] presents what we may take to be evidence of the ritual of the Hanukkah-lamp in the rite's simplest and first form. This passage is one where the law of liability for damage and compensation is being set forth: "If a camel laden with flax is going down the public street and the flax penetrates into a shop, and is set aflame by the shop-lamp and burns the building, then the owner of the camel is responsible. Had the shopkeeper set his lamp outside, then he, the owner of the shop, is responsible. Rabbi Jehudah says, that were the lamp the Hanukkah-lamp, he (the owner of the shop) is free (from liability)." The scene is set in the narrow streets of the cities in the Orient. A tradesman who had been negligent enough to place a lamp outside his shop, was liable for accidents of the kind described; but if it were the Hanukkah-lamp, which must needs be placed there (מבחוץ), then he is absolved from the consequences, on the ground of religious duty. The doorway of the house or shop is presupposed as the position of the Hanukkah-lamp. We gain the impression of being here in the realm of long-established custom.

---

[1] Cf. Gressmann, *Tod und Auferstehung des Osiris nach Festbräuchen und Umzügen*, p. 38: "Dies Fest 'der brennenden Lampen' hat man wohlmit Recht als ein Allerseelenfest gedeutet." Cf. Frazer, *Adonis, Attis, Osiris*, 3rd ed., ii. 51 f. For lamp in All-Souls' festival—festival of Diwali—(among Hindus of the Punjab), see Frazer, *Golden Bough*, vol. ii. p. 176.

[2] B.Q. vi. 6b: גמל שהיה טעון פשתן ועובר ברשות הרבים ונכנסה פשתנו לתוך החנות ודלקה בנרו של חנוני והדליק את־הבירה בעל־הגמל חיב הניח החנוני נרו מבחוץ החנוני חיב רבי יהודה אומר בנר־חנכה פטור:

When we meet with more definite references to the Hanukkah-lamp in later writings, in the scholia of Meg. Taʿan. ix., in Sab. 21, b f., and in Maimonides (*Hilkoth Meg.*), where the prescriptions concerning the ritual are elaborated, it appears still more clearly what the original rite was. It becomes a meritorious act to light a lamp for each person;[1] it is discussed whether the lamps should be increased or decreased in number as the festival days advance.[2] Meg. Taʿan. (cf. Sab. 21, b) prescribes that the lamp be lit at sunset, that it be placed at the door of the house, outside, that a dweller in an upper storey place the lamp in the window looking to the street, that if scoffers be attracted to a house by the lamp, this be set at the door, inside, and in the days of persecution on the table.[3] The lamp is fixed within a hand-breath from the door-opening, on the left side opposite the Mezuzah (Sab. 22, a).[4] A court in which there are two doorways on two different fronts must have two lamps, lest perchance those that pass by one entrance and see no light there should be led to suppose of the owner "he has not placed the Hanukkah-lamp" (Maim. iv. 10; cf. Sab. 23, a).[1] Has one lit it in the interior of the house and set it at the doorway, the act is void till he lights it in its place (Maim. iv. 9; cf. Sab. 22, b).[2] From Maimonides, back to the earliest glimpse of the rite of the lamp as we have it in B.Q., we see one particular feature maintained and asserting itself in face of adverse circumstances. A quantity of detail has gathered round the practice of the rite in the process of its being subject to Rabbinic prescriptions. But distinguished therefrom is the simple "mizvah" precept or *Vorschrift*, which enables us to see the primary ritual element—"a lamp for a man and his household" (Meg. Taʿan. ix.; Sab. 21, b), a lamp "at the door of his house outside" (*ibid.*).[3] It is certainly in this ritual, not only of the lamp, to which various "hieroi logoi" attached, but also of its *placing*, that an explanation of Hanukkah as festival of "lights" is to be sought.

---

[1] Meg. Taʿan. ix.; Sab. 21, b.

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] Meg. Taʿan. ix.: מצות הדלקתה משתשקע החמה עד שתכלה רגל מן השוק ומצוה להניחה על פתח ביתו מבחוץ ואם היה דר בעליה מניחה בחלון הסמוכה לרשות הרבים ואם מתירא מן הלצים מניחה על פתח ביתו מפנים ובשעת הסכנה מניחה על שולחנו ודיו; Cf. Sab. 21, b.

[4] Sab. 22, a: בטפח הסמוכה לפתח . . . והילכתא משמאל כדי שת הא נר חנוכה משמאל ומזווה מימין; Cf. Maim. *Hilk. Meg. wa-Han.* iv. 7.

The policy of the Hellenization of Judaism had been in conscious operation from the beginning of Antiochus' reign. Jason, whose name 1 M. seems purposely to refrain from mentioning (cf. Meyer, *Ursprung*, Bd. ii. p. 144, note 2), was not alone in cherishing the sentiment, "Let us go and make a covenant with the nations that are round about us; for since we separated ourselves from them many evils have come upon us" (i. 11). Because Jason meets the policy of the king, he is chosen high-priest in place of his brother, 174 B.C. Menelaus the Tobiad succeeds Jason, and is an instrument still more pliable than a member of the high-priestly family could be for furthering the king's designs. A new stage is reached after Antiochus on pressure from Rome has returned from his second Egyptian campaign. Angry at his reverse, hearing that in his absence Jason had attempted to regain office and power by an attack upon Jerusalem, perceiving possibly (cf. Meyer, *ibid.*, p. 166) that both parties within Judaism, the high-priestly and the orthodox, had placed their hope on Egypt, he resolves on more compulsory methods, on a more thorough-going accomplishment of his plan for the religious unification of his kingdom. 1 and 2 M. permit us to discern the method which Epiphanes adopted to secure his aim. Certain Jewish practices, such as circumcision, were forbidden; others, the Sabbaths and festivals, were "profaned" (1 M. i. xlv. f). The sacrificial service, as formerly practised at the temple, was specially singled out for attack—the "whole burnt-offerings and sacrifices and drink-offerings" were made to cease. That is, the Deuteronomic law of the central sanctuary at Jerusalem, requiring that the sacrifices that were made took place there, was seen to be a chief obstacle and a feature of Jewish idiosyncrasy which, if Antiochus' plan was to succeed, must be removed. The new altar of Zeus Olympius (2 M. vi. 2), the "abomination of desolation," which was a small altar erected on the large altar of burnt-offering (1 M. i. 54), would still attach periodical public sacrifices to the shrine as far as Jerusalem was concerned. But now (1 M. i. 51) each town is ordered to conduct its own public sacrifices (*θυσιάζειν κατὰ πόλιν καὶ πόλιν*). Further, in addition to these changes which have regard to public sacrifices, the religious requirements of individuals who had formerly to sojourn to the temple were met by a practice of Hellenic religion that was calculated to have an attraction and hold of a powerful and intimate kind. "In the cities of Judah on every side they built altars, and at the doors of the houses and in the streets they burned sacrifices (or incense)":[1] *καὶ ἐν πόλεσιν 'Ιούδα κύκλῳ ᾠκοδόμησαν βωμούς. καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν θυρίδων τῶν οἰκιῶν, καὶ ἐν ταῖς πλατείαις ἐθυμίων* (1 M. i. 54–55).

---

[1] Maim. iv. 10: חצר שיש לה שני׳ פתחי׳ בשתי׳ רוחות צריכה שתי נרות שמא יאמרו העוברים ברוח זו לא הניח נר . . .

[2] Maim. iv. 9: לא עשה כלום עד שידליקנו במקומו.

[3] Meg. Taʿan. ix. (Neubauer): מצות[נר] חנוכה נר[אחד] איש וביתו. Sab. 21, b: נר איש וביתו . . . על פתח ביתו מבחוץ.

If we make a twofold classification of Jewish sacrifice, as do Josephus and Maimonides, and distinguish those that were offered in behalf of the whole congregation, and those offered in behalf of individuals in time of bodily accident or in respect of other misfortune, guilt, or vow, it must be evident how deeply the regulations of Epiphanes struck at the sacrificial system in both aspects.[2] Rich and elaborate as were the sacrifices of the public cultus of the temple, and minutely as the description of this has been handed down, they bear no comparison to the numerous offerings that were made by individuals. From the standpoint alone which permits us to view the important place the conceptions of "uncleanness" and restoring to "cleanness" occupied in the sacrificial system, bringing the private person into relation with the temple-cultus, we may estimate the design of the introduction of those altars at the doors of the houses. Antiochus' purpose was to decentralize and to individualize the ritual practices of the Jewish religion. Only then could Hellenization, however far it had progressed, have a chance of becoming complete. Obedience to the Jewish ritual-law was therefore now forbidden on penalty of death (1 M. i. 50). The altars at the doors, in the streets, were intended, without doubt, for the multitude of private offerings which used to be made at the central Place. It was a new cult-form and concept of deity, to which Epiphanes sought to compel the Jews, not the acceptance of any new God.[1] His edict seeks to force upon the Jews as a whole, a custom with which we must conclude the Hellenized among them were already acquainted. The domestic rite of offering at the house-doors was one, too, which would awaken religious beliefs and practices which had never been less than dormant. The apotropaic and kathartic purposes to which these burnings at the doors ministered in the various exigences of private life, would combine with those usages of exorcism which in the Book of Tobit (Charles, *Apoc.*, *circa* 170 B.C.) are perfectly reconciled with deep Jewish piety and which there takes the form of burning substances on the ashes of incense (*τέρφαν τῶν θυμιαμάτων*, 8^2).

---

[1] *ἐθυμίων.* Meyer, Bd. ii. p. 160, translates "sie räucherten"; Oesterley (Charles, *Apoc.*, vol. i. p. 71), "they offered sacrifice" (but 1 M. iv. 50, *ἐθυμίασαν*, "they burned incense"); Kautzsch, *Apok.*, Bd. i., "sie opferten." Heb. of 1 M. i. 55, would use verb קטר (cf. Stade, *Bib. Theol. des A.T.*, p. 159) = burning of sacrifices—no difference between Piel and Hiph. In P, according to Nowack, *Lehrbuch d. Heb. Arch.*, Bd. ii. p. 246 f., Hiph. used of the burning of incense. The Latin version, L. 1, "they burned incense and offered sacrifice," is probably the best rendering. 2 M. x. 2, speaks of altars on the "agora" (Moffatt, "market-place"). Kamphausen and others (cf. Kautzsch, *Apok.*, Bd. i. p. 105, note) understand by this "altars in public places" (Vulg., "per plateas"; Luther, "hin und wieder auf den Gassen"). But the *πυρεῖα* (thuribula, tripodes, acerras) which Hippolytus mentions in exposition of Rev. xiii. 17 (*περὶ χριστοῦ καὶ ἀντιχρίστου*, xlix., Migne, tome x. p. 770) would appear to be on the market-place.

[2] Jos. *Ant.* iii. 9. 1: *δύο μὲν γάρ εἰσιν ἱερουργίαι τούτων δ' ἣ μὲν ὑπὸ τῶν ἰδιωτῶν, ἑτέρα δ' ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου συντειλούμεναι κ.τ.λ.* Cf. Maim., *Praefatio in quintam Misnae partem*, iii. 1 f.; Paterson, "Sacrifice," *H.B.D.*; Schürer, *Gesch.*, Bd. ii. p. 341 f.: "Die Hauptmasse der Opfer bildeten natürlich die zahlreichen Privatopfer der verschiedenen Arten"; p. 357: "Die Menge der letzteren (Privatopfern) die man sich kaum gross genug wird vorstellen können, bildete die eigentliche Signatur des Kultus von Jerusalem."

---

[1] Reitzenstein, *Die Hellen. Myst. Relig.*, p. 106, Anm. 1: "Antiochus will nicht im geringsten damit den Juden einen neuen Gott aufzwingen, sondern nur den Begriff und die Kultform, die dem helleniesierten Judentum der Diaspora schon vertraut war."

In the offerings at the doors of the houses and in the streets, the concept of deity involved is that particularly associated with the cult of Apollo, the patron deity of the Seleucid House. The oldest image of Apollo was a pointed pillar or conical column, raised before the house-doors on the streets. To the altar which stood near at hand offerings and gifts, incense and such-like, were brought.[1] He is the God not only of settlements and colonies, but especially of the ways and of the traffic. As patron and protector of the way he was honoured in many places under the name ’Αγυιεύς. His "epikleseis" recall the duties he performed as protector of the domestic happiness, as guardian of man's going from, and coming into, his home. He is Θυραῖος, Προπύλαιος, Προστατήριος, Προστάτης, the Doorkeeper, the One before the gates, the Protector, the Guardian.[2] As keeping away all ills from the household and having the power of healing, he is ’Αλεξίκακος, ’Αποτροπαῖος, Προφύλαξ, Αὐλαριοκός, Δωματίτης, Οἰκέτας.[3] His connexion with the house, the door, and the street, proclaims his peculiar office as patron, and as averter of all evil. Farnell says of the significance of Apollo for the Greek πόλις: "He becomes, as already at the dawn of Greek history he was, one of a special group of deities that presided over the communion of the family, the clan, the village, and finally of the πόλις, the last development of these. His cone-shaped pillar stood in the street before the door of the citizen; and Apollo ἀγυιεύς becomes the Apollo προστατήριος, the God 'who stands before the door' and shields the household from the terrors of the seen and unseen world."[4] Philostratos describes

---

[1] Cf. Leopold von Schroeder, *Arische Religion*, Bd. ii. S. 218; Roscher, *Lexikon, usw.*, "Apollon," S. 449.

[2] Cf. Wernicke, "Apollon," *Pauly-Wissowa*, col. 19 f.

[3] *Ibid.*, col. 35 f.

[4] Farnell, "Rel. of Greece," *H.B.D.*, extra vol., p. 144 f.

Apollonius (*Vita. Ap.* viii. 13) as praying before he enters the house (*Ἀπόλλωνι καὶ ἔτι τῷ Ἡλίῳ*) to Apollo and to Helios. In Athens the worship of Apollo as *Prostaterios*, the Protector of entrance and exit, took place at the doors (Schol., *Soph. El.* 637; *O.C.* 919).

The statement of 1 M., "they burned offerings at the doors of the houses and (*καί*) on the streets," if the conjunction be not a Hebraism, has light shed upon it by Reisch (*Pauly-Wissowa*, "Altar," col. 1647). In the Athenian houses, Reisch says, Apollo Patroos had a special altar which regularly stood at the entrance of the house and was evidently not distinguished from the *ἀγυιεὺς βωμός* or street-altar.[1] Again, of the street-altars themselves he states, "These street-altars are all (or at least most of them) to be regarded as house-altars; they belong to the houses before the doors of which they stand (cf. Petersen, *Hausgottesdienst der Griechen*, p. 14), and serve the cult of Apollo, which indeed had its place here."[2]

Kern (*Archiv für Religionswiss.*, xxii. 1923–24, p. 198) and Reitzenstein (*Die Hellenist. Myst. Rel.*, p. 106) point to the reference by Hippolytus (*περὶ χριστοῦ καὶ ἀντιχρίστου*, 49) to two customs of Hellenistic religion which Judaism had especially to resist, and on account of which the religious struggle came most acutely to expression. These two practices to which, as marks of Hellenism, the Jews under Antiochus were forced, are brought by Hippolytus closely together—the offering upon altars set at the doors, and the processions in honour of Dionysus. Hippolytus' statement,[1] supported by Lydus (*De mens.* iv. 53), is, that Antiochus Epiphanes "in those times being lifted up in heart, wrote a decree that altars be placed before the doors and that all should sacrifice thereon and, crowned with ivy, should make procession in honour of Dionysus," and that those who did not obey should suffer torture. This statement does not seem to be taken from the work of Jason of Cyrene as is suggested by Kern (cf. Reitzenstein, *loc. cit.*), for Hippolytus refers his readers to the Books of Maccabees,[2] but nevertheless it appears to retain a true tradition of the two chief signs of the acceptance of Hellenism in the days of the Syrian persecution. For Hippolytus, who is depicting the marks of the "Beast" or Antichrist, of whom he regards Antiochus as a forerunner, these two practices are the two sacral acts which implied submission to Hellenism. When now we compare the passage from Hippolytus with the above-given excerpts from Valerius Maximus, we find that the picture of the Hellenized Jew, drawn by the two writers, is the same. The Jews expelled from Rome were known as Sabazius-worshippers. On the other hand, they had private altars which were also street-altars (*arasque privatas e publicis locis abiecit*). These latter we must certainly regard as those mentioned in 1 M. i. 55 and as additional historical evidence of the practices connected with the ἀγυιεὺς βωμός having been adopted by Jews, whose Judaism had accepted Hellenistic cult-forms. If, further, we conclude at all that the practices of Hanukkah are of non-Jewish origin, that they are pagan customs transformed, then in those burnings on the street-altars at the doors we have the archetype which is historically most apt to explain the ritual of the light set at the doors of the houses, outside, on the days of the festival.

---

[1] "In den athenischen Häusern wird ausserdem noch der Patroos auf einem besonderen Altar (Deinarch bei Harpocr. s. *Ἑρκεῖος*) verehrt, der regelmässig an dem Hauseingang steht und offenbar nicht verschieden ist von dem *ἀγυιεὺς βωμός*."

[2] Reisch, *Ἀγυιεύς* (*P.-W.* col. 912): "Diese Strassenaltäre sind alle (oder doch die meisten) als Hausaltäre zu betrachten: sie gehören zu den Häusern, vor deren Türen sie stehen (vgl. Petersen, usw.) und dienen dem Apollokult, der ja hier seinen Platz hatte."

---

[1] Cf. Migne, *Patrologiæ cursus completus*, tome x.—Hippol., *ut sup.*, p. 770: "Οὕτω γὰρ ἐτεχνάσατο κατὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων καὶ Ἀντίοχος ὁ Ἐπιφανὴς . . . καὶ αὐτὸς τοῖς τότε καιροῖς ἐπαρθεὶς τῇ καρδίᾳ ἔγραψε ψήφισμα "βωμοὺς πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν τιθέντας" ἅπαντας ἐπιθύσειν καὶ κισσοὺς ἐστεφανωμένους πομπεύειν τῷ Διονύσῳ. Τοὺς δὲ μὴ βουλομένους ὑποτάσσεσθαι, τούτους μετὰ ἀπαγχισμὸν καὶ ἐτασμὸν βασάνων ἀναιρεῖσθαι. Kern thinks the altars at the doors were in honour of Dionysus; but cf. Reisch (*ut sup.*, note 3, col. 910 f.), also the Magnesian prescription (Dittenb., *Syll.* ii.³, nr. 695) that house- and shop- owners set altars with inscription Ἀρτέμιδος Λευκοφρυηνῆς Νικηφόρου before the doors. Now Artemis is the female counterpart of Apollo. Cf. p. 242 below (note 1).

[2] *Ibid.*: καὶ ταῦτα μέν εἴ τις βούλοιτο λεπτομερῶς ἐνιστορῆσαι, σεσήμανται ἐν τοῖς Μακκαβαικοῖς (cf. 2 M. vii. 7; 1 M. i. 55). In face of this, Kern's statement that "diese Hippolytosstelle . . . wird ohne Zweifel auf Jason von Kyrene zurückgehen" falls.

Even from those myths which attach early to ritual it may not be expected that they at once reveal what the origin of the ritual was. Still less can we expect this where, in the case of the ritual of Hanukkah, it is surmised that a heathen rite has been rendered innocuous and reinterpreted. But if the origin of the ritual be discovered, then it is probable that some features of the myth or legend concerning it may themselves be explained. The earliest explanation of the light-symbol of Hanukkah is the festival-legend of 2 M. i. 18 f., for which Hanukkah is the festival of "Booths and of the Fire" (τοῦ πυρός), a legend in which the ideas relating to the sacred sacrificial fire are due to Jewish contact with Iranian thought ("nur aus iranischen Vorstellungen verständlich," Gressmann, *Zeitschrift für Kirch. Gesch.* xli. 1922, p. 179). But to those ideas concerning the clean fire brought from heaven, the conceptions of the nature of the Hellenic deity, whose altars were set at the doors, on the streets, were closely allied and capable of assimilation. For comparison we may point to the inscriptions which, at a later date, Antiochus I. (*circa* 40 B.C.), of Commagene, placed on the monument on the

Nimrud Dagh, where we see a thorough syncretism of Iranian and Hellenic religion.[1] Here Mithras is equated with Apollo (=Helios=Hermes), an identification which, though they have other characteristics in common,[2] is certainly made on account of their both being Light-Gods. Though Apollo, as early as the time of Euripides, is equated with Helios, in his own individuality he is Light-God and associated with the phenomenon of fire.[3] To this nature of Apollo as Fire-God both myth and custom bear witness. According to the Homeric hymn (to Apollo, v. 440 f.), Apollo, in form of a dolphin, meets the Cretans voyaging on the sea, guides them to Krisa, springs on land as a God, revealing himself in glorious splendour :

"Then from the ship sprang the far-darting Apollo,
Like a star in middle-day, and there flew
Sparks from him in myriads, their brightness ascending to the heavens.
He entered the shrine, where stand the glorious tripods,
And lit the fire therein, making visible his bolts."

Here Apollo is lighter of the sacred fire of the sanctuary. Coins of Amphipolis (*circa* 400 B.C.), Klazomenæ, Katane, and other places represent, on one side, the head of the God, and on the other, a torch (*Furtwängler Ap.* in Roscher, p. 464). The seats of Apollo, Delphi, and Delos are the homes of the holy and pure fire. From the latter place it was the annual custom to bring the holy flame to Lemnos to renew the fires that had been extinguished in workshop and house. The concept of deity involved therefore in the rites in honour of Apollo is in very striking harmony with the theological thought and doctrine of the Jewish "hieros logos" of the festival "of the fire."[1] And when we regard the ritual of the burnings "at the doors and in the streets" as the origin of the light-symbol of Hanukkah, we perceive that in three features—the fire, the sacrifice, and the altar—the festival-legend has preserved relations with the original ritual also, in externals.

---

[1] Cf. Gressmann, *Die hellenistische Gestirnreligion*, p. 22 f. ; *Early Zoroast.*, Hib. Lecture, Moulton, p. 107 f.

[2] *e.g.* God of contracts, oaths, and covenants (cf. Wernicke, *P.-W.*, "Apol." ; Geiger, *Ostiran. Kultur*, p. 234)—God of the house and home (cf. Geiger, *ibid.*, p. 200, Mithra : "welcher stark macht die Türpfosten")—enemy of evil demons—oracle-giving Gods (Gressmann, *ibid.*, p. 23).

[3] Schroeder, *Arische Religion*, vol. ii. p. 499 f.

The observations we have made find confirmation in evidence from another direction. In Cypriote bilingual inscriptions, the Phœnician Resheph (name, or title, of the deity) is identified with Apollo. Resheph of Amyklæ (*C.I.S.* i. 1. 89), לרשף מכל, is in the Greek *τῷ Απόλλωνι τῷ Ἀμυκλοῖ*; רשף אלהיתם = *Ἀπολωνι τωι Ἀλασιωτα*, and רשף אליית = *Ἀπειλωνι τωι Ἐλειται*, are also found at Tamassus (cf. Driver, *Deut.*, p. 368). Another form of the name (*C.I.S.*, *ib.* 10) is remarkable, רשפחץ (cf. Meg. Taʿan., *ut sup.* על פתח ביתו מבחוץ), and Clermont-Ganneau (*Recueil d'Arch. Orient.*, p. 179 f.) has conjectured that here we have the equivalent of *Ἀπόλλων Ἀγυιεύς*.[2] Also, as Professor Driver remarks, "it can thus hardly be accidental that the modern name of the town which occupies the site of the ancient *Apollonias*, near Jaffa, should be called *Arsuph*." Now in the O.T. the word רשף (Cant. viii. 6; Job v. 7; Ps. lxxvi. 4, lxxviii. 48; Deut. xxxii. 24; Hab. iii. 5; cf. Heb. of Sirach xliii. 17) signifies "flame," "spark," "fire-bolt," "pointed darting flame." The name of the Phœnician Apollo therefore is seen to be in Hebrew thought expressive of fire. Transferred uses of the word רשף as intending "arrows" (Ps. lxxvi. 4) or "fever" (Deut. xxxii. 24) bring it, perhaps unconsciously, within the sphere of mythological conceptions and into even closer relations with aspects of Apollo.[1] When, however, in the Psalm of Hab. iii. Deber (Pestilence) and Resheph (Fire-bolt, Fever) proceed before Jahveh in the theophany, we have reason to believe that the agencies of disease are not here merely personified, but that poetry has become inspired by mythology,[2] and that the Babylonian goddess of pestilence, Dibbarra, and the Phœnician Resheph have been turned into ministering servants of the supreme God. The festival-legend of the "fire" in 2 M. i. 18 f. would seem, in its origin, to base upon the same method of converting pagan elements to Jahvism, in this case, by employing the Jewish saga of Nehemiah, and the bringing of the nephtar-flame or clean fire, as counterpart for the Resheph-Apollo concept; even as the light-symbol of Hanukkah, נר על פתח מבחוץ, had become counterpart for the Thyraios-Agyieus rites.

---

[1] Both Dionysus and Apollo are concerned in the production of fire, and their vegetable symbols—ivy sacred to Dionysus, laurel (and oak) to Apollo—may each "be described as a fire-stick," *i.e.* as sticks capable under friction of giving out the sacred fire concealed or hidden within them (Rendel Harris, *The Origin of the Cult of Apollo*, 1916, p. 19; cf. pp. 9, 17).

[2] The Nabatæans gave also their Dusares this character. Though Dusares, god of natural life and fruitfulness, was equated with Dionysus, it was as solar deity that he was worshipped at altars set *ἐπὶ τοῦ δώματος* (cf. Apollo Domatites). Strabo, xvi. 784 (cf. Cumont, "Dusares," *P.-W.*, 1905), says of the Nabatæans, Ἥλιον *τιμῶσιν ἐπὶ τοῦ δώματος ἱδρυσάμενοι βωμόν*. Cf. Frazer, *Folklore in O.T.* ("The Keepers of the Threshold"), vol. iii. p. 17: "Among the Gonds of the Central Provinces of India the sun, or, as they call him, Nārāyan Deo, is a household deity. He has a little platform inside the threshold of the house." In time of misfortune the Gonds sacrifice to him on the threshold. ". . . the sun is apparently conceived as a guardian deity who keeps watch and ward at the threshold of the houses."

---

[1] Apollo, while ἰατρός, healer, averter of evil, and of demons, is also ἑκατηβόλος, able to strike with pestilence and death (cf. Driver, *ut sup*. to Deut. xxxii. 24, and Wernicke, *P.-W.*, "Apollo").

[2] Cf. St. J. Thackeray, *Septuagint and Jewish Worship*, p. 51 f., who sees in the LXX translation, Hab. iii. 5, of "Resheph" in terms of ornithology (cf. Driver, *ut sup.*), a trace of Greek mythology, due to attributes of the god Resheph, and adds: "indeed the original Hebrew of this old Jewish song seems to contain a mythological and semi-pagan element."

It may be asked how it was that the street-altars to which 1 M. i. 55 refers, and which were for constant private use, came to have particular connexion with the festival which Hanukkah supplanted. This may be left to nearer consideration when we have drawn conclusions as to the nature of the heathen festival which took place on the 25th of Kislev, and which, on our hypothesis, included rites which did honour both to Dionysus and Apollo. We know, however, that not only was the seventh day of the month sacred to Apollo, but also the day of the new-moon (cf. Wernicke, *P.-W.*, "Apollon"), and that such a day, the 1st of Tebeth, was included in the eight days of Hanukkah. This may not have been without moment in the planning of the actions of the festival. In a passage which Nilsson entitles a "type of *Apolline* piety" (*Theopom. in Porphyr. de abst.* ii. 16), though only Hermes and Hekate are the divinities mentioned, Klearchus, describing how best the gods should be honoured, says that "every month on the new-moon day he wreathes and decorates the pillars of Hermes and of Hekate, and the other shrines . . . and he honours them with incense and bruised barley and sacrificial cakes, performing annual public sacrifices and omitting no festival."[1] But also, if we regard, with Kautzsch (*Apok.*, Bd. i. S. 36, Anm. d.), 1 M. i. 59 as implying that public sacrifice on the small heathen altar on the altar of burnt-offering took place on the 25th of *every* month ("Opfer am 25. jeden Monates"), it would seem that this occasion was no other than the monthly compulsion of the Jews of which the preceding verse (1 M. i. 58) speaks, that is (cf. Wellhausen, *Nachr*. S. 131), the monthly king's-birthday (2 M. vi. 7). The religious festival of the 25th Kislev would therefore have a dynastic aspect, and we may well think that burnings on the street-altars of the patron deity of the Seleucid House were not omitted.

---

[1] *Die Religion der Griechen*, p. 47: "Ein Typus der apollinischen Frömmigkeit"; "Da sagte Klearchuos, er vollziehe die Opfer mit grossem Eifer zu den üblichen Zeiten, jeden Monat am Neumonds-tage bekränze und schmücke er die Säulen des Hermes und der Hekate und die übrigen Heiligtümer, die die Vorfahren hinterlassen hätten, und er ehre sie durch Weihrauch und Gerstenschrot und Opferkuchen: jährlich vollziehe er öffentlich Opfer, wobei er kein Fest übergehe."

Another question relates to the *form* of the ritual which supplanted the altars at the doors. It cannot be expected that within orthodox Judaism any vestige of these altars themselves could remain, for they struck at the root of the Jewish cultus, the sacrificial system, the עבודה which Simon the Just had regarded as one of the three things on which the world is founded.[1] A lamp in the place where the burnings had taken place may seem to be no unsuitable substitute or memorial in honour of Jahveh. But probably for the form of ritual, that is, the substitution of a lamp for former sacrifices, there is an analogy in the origin of the practice of lighting of lamps for the dead. Schwally (*Das Leben nach dem Tode*, SS. 39–41) believes, that though it has not the direct witness of Scripture, the "lamp of the dead" is an ancient institution,[2] and that the phrase "the lamp of the wicked will be put out" (cf. 1 Kings xi. 36; 2 Kings viii. 19; Job xxi. 17, xviii. 6; Prov. xxiv. 20, xiii. 9, xx. 20) refers to this custom. The wicked man will have no descendant to light this lamp for him. The same author also cites, from the *Peraqim* of Rabbi Eliezer (chap. 36),

[1] Cf. Taylor, *Pirque Aboth*, i. 2: העבודה "in the mouth of a high-priest means the service and sacrifice of the Temple." Cf. Meg. 31, b; Taʿan, 27, b. Cf. Strack, *ad loc.* in פרקי אבות, Leipzig, 1901: "Gottesdienst mit Opfern im Tempel. Erst nach der Zerstörung des Tempels wird 'עבודה' auch zur Bezeichnung des Gebets gebraucht."

[2] "Ihre Verwendung (d. h. der Totenlampe) in der ältesten Zeit ist wohl nur durch Zufall nicht quellenmässig nachzuweisen."

a work at earliest of the eighth century A.D., a passage of fabulous character which speaks of lamps being lit before the "teraphim," which he and Stade take to signify an ancestral image.[1] But at whatever date the practice arose, it is probable that, as already in the pre-Israelite history of Palestine, lamps are buried under the threshold, or in the corner of the house, as symbolic sacrifices and as substitute for the former human sacrifice which was the foundation-offering of an earlier period,[2] the lighting of the lamp for the dead is substitute for the burnings of spices at burials. The writer of 2 Chron. xvi. 14, xxi. 19 (cf. Jos. *Bell. Jud.* i. 33. 9) speaks of such burnings being made for certain of the kings. What these burnings intended cannot be doubted. "The sweet savour which it was believed the dead person on such occasions was able to enjoy, reminds us of the sweet savour of the sacrifices which were burned as offering to the deity (*Die israel. Vorstellungen vom*

---

[1] But cf. Bertholet, *Die isr. Vorstellungen vom Zustand nach dem Tode*, regarding this hypothesis concerning the teraphim: "Es möchte überhaupt scheinen als sei für Israel die Ahnenkult-hypothese, die namentlich in Stade und Schwally ihre überzeugten Vertreter gefunden hat, nur mit einer gewissen Reserve aufrechtzuerhalten," p. 35. Cf. Gressmann, *Die älteste Geschichtsschreibung und Prophetie Israels*, 1910, p. 87: "Teraphim nach Gen. xxxi. 30 deutet eher auf eine Maske als auf ein Gottesbild. . . . beide (d. h. Teraphim und Ephod) entsprechen einander als Maske und Kleid der Gottheit, die vom Priester angelegt werden, wenn er ein Orakel erteilen will . . . Im allgemeinen aber sank er, der Teraphim, zum Gegenstand der Posse herab."

[2] Gressmann, *ibid.*, p. 256: "Kinder in grossen Tonkrügen, auch Frauen und Männer wurden, besonders unter den Fundamenten der Mauer und Tore, lebendig eingemauert, um der Gottheit eine Sühne für den Bau zu verschaffen. Obwohl sich diese schaurigen Sitten vereinzelt bis in die Königszeit gehalten haben, sind sie doch im allgemeinen gemildert worden. Man begnügte sich gewöhnlich mit einem symbolischen Opfer indem man nur die Beigaben (die Töpfe, Krüge, Lampen) darbrachte." Cf. Gressmann, *Texte und Bilder*, 1909, ii. p. 52 f. Abb. 86 f. Bertholet, *ut sup.*, p. 24, p. 25: "Freilich ist an die Stelle des menschlichen Opfers schon etwa seit der Mitte des 2. Jahrtausends ein Ersatz eingetreten in Gestalt von Tonlampen."

Zustand nach dem Tode, Bertholet, S. 11).[1] According to Bertholet it is difficult to reject the belief that the Israelite mourning-meal had originally cultic character, and Nowack, Schwally, and Stade regard Jer. xvi. 7 (cf. Deut. xxvi. 14) as actually referring to offerings made to the dead.[2] The thought here would be that the dead partake of the bread and of the cup. But apart from this passage, which may already reflect a stage where the original conception of offerings being made to the dead was being largely abandoned, it is evident that while some Jewish mourning customs, when felt to be inconsistent with Jahvism, were directly forbidden, others were subject to refinement. It would seem certain that the lamp for the dead is a refinement of what was at one time more obviously an *oblatio pro defunctis*,[3] in particular, we may suppose, of the burning of spices.

---

[1] *Loc. cit.*, p. 11: "Der liebliche Duft den, wie man nicht bezweifelt, der Tote in solchem Falle noch zu geniessen vermag, erinnert bereits an den lieblichen Duft der Opfer, die man der Gottheit zu Ehren anzündet."

[2] Bertholet, *ibid.*: "Man kommt darum auch beim israelitischen Totenmahl schwer um den Gedanken herum, dass es ursprünglich kultischen Character getragen habe." Cf. Nowack, *Arch.*, Bd. i. p. 196 f. (Jer. xvi. 5 f.): "Danach kann darüber kein Zweifel sein, dass den Toten das Brot gebrochen vgl. Deut. xxvi. 14, und der Becher gereicht wurde." "Wie lange freilich diese Bedeutung dieser Sitten sich erhalten hat, lässt sich nicht bestimmen; zur Zeit des Siraciden ist offenbar jedes Bewusstsein davon geschwunden." Schwally, *ut sup.* p. 21 f. Stade, *Bib. Theol. des A.T.*, p. 187. Driver, *Deut.* to 26. 14, p. 291 f., sees in Jer. xvi. 7 only a custom of friends of the dead "testifying their sympathy" with mourners at funeral feasts. (So also H. Schmidt, *Die Grossen Propheten*, 1915, p. 226 f.)

[3] Stade, *ibid.*, p. 187: "Die Empfindung für die Unverträglichkeit der in A.I. aufzuzählenden Trauerbräuche (*i.e.* d. 'verbrannte Rauchwerk,' etc.) mit dem Jahvehkult hat sich im Laufe der Zeit verfeinert." Cf. Tertullian (*de Corona*, cap. iii.): "oblationes pro defunctis"; *Smith's Dict. of Christian Antiquities*, Art. "Mourning"; cf. Hefele, *History of the Councils*, vol. i. p. 150, Canon 34 of the Synod of Elvira, A.D. 305: "ne cerei in cemeteriis incendantur." For the custom among the Samaritans of burning candles at head and foot of corpse before burial, and of burning combustible articles at Joseph's tomb, cf. Montgomery, *The Samaritans*, p. 43 f.

While the custom of lighting lamps, or candles, for the dead is best explained as the transformation of the older practice of burning offerings, and, thus regarded, exhibits the lamp as ritual form of substitute for these burnings, the association in idea of lamp and altar is natural in itself, and has received beautiful representation in ancient art.[1]

---

[1] *e.g.* the lampadarium found in the house of Diomedes at Pompeii in 1812 is of the form of a Corinthian column bearing on one side a tragic mask, and on the other a bucranium or bull's skull. From four branches issuing from the top of the column hang double-wick lamps. On the base on which the column rests, and which is inlaid in silver with clusters of vine leaves, is a figure of Acratus, a genius of Bacchus, rhyton in hand, mounted on a panther, and opposite to him a small altar of the sacred fire. See reproduction in bronze ("Lampadarium of Diomedes") in Edinburgh Museum.

CHAPTER VI

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE LAMP—THE THEORY OF GRÄTZ

CHAPTER VI

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE LAMP—THE THEORY OF GRÄTZ

I

WHEN the custom of the altars at the doors was transformed, what significance was given to the lamp? When once the opinion is formed that in Hanukkah there lies before us a judaizing of heathen practice, it must also be assumed that conscious and deliberate reflection effected the transformation and determined significances. In investigation of the ideas that were operative in giving interpretation to the Hanukkah-lamp on the reforming of Hellenic rites, we must be aware of the unique position Hanukkah holds among Hebrew festivals. The old Canaanite festivals were endowed with historical explanation after a long period of their acceptance by Israel had elapsed. Their being moulded by Jahvism, the elimination of offensive elements, was a gradual process. But in Hanukkah a judaizing and reinterpreting set in suddenly, either entirely in 164 B.C. or in the next years. Historical significance was not evolved for it, as in the case of the other festivals, by the natural growth of tradition, of priestly speculation and teaching, but was provided at once in the recovery of the temple and the reinstitution of its worship. The rites and practices of the festival Hanukkah supplanted had to be rendered innocuous and reinterpreted then. From the nature of the case we have here to do with considered and reflective reinterpretation. It is this fact we must keep before us when we approach the theory of Grätz as to the meaning of the Hanukkah-lamp, for it is the reflective character of Grätz's explanation which has led to its being summarily dismissed (*e.g.* by Krauss and Hochfeld). A new "religious reason" had to be found, and the moment we do not rest in the discovery of the origin of the ritual but ask for significances, we seem to be directed to what were central thoughts in Judaism, especially such as were attacked by or connected with the ritual suppressed. Hochfeld (p. 267 f.) objects to Grätz's explanation as a "symbolizing" (*Symbolisierung*). But when we have traced the ritual of the lamp to its origin and seek the meaning of the new rite, we cannot avoid symbol.

Grätz (*History of the Jews*, vol. i. p. 488) says that the Hanukkah of the temple denoted the "victory of Judaism over Hellenic idolatry," and that in the festival "the inhabitants of Jerusalem lit bright lamps in front of their houses as a symbol of the Law, called 'light' by the poets." This explanation he leaves without further support and resting entirely upon the basis of metaphor. The words of Prov. vi. 23, "the commandment is a lamp, and the law is light" (כי נר מצוה ותורה אור), may be taken as representative of what Grätz intends us to have in mind. God, His instruction, His word, His commandments, His prophets, the knowledge of God, Wisdom, are conceived of in the O.T. as spiritual light. It might be possible to draw certain conclusions from the greater frequency with which this thought appears in certain books (cf. Hamburger, *R.E. d. Jud.*, 1896, art. "Licht"), but whenever religion finds utterance, particularly in poetry and song, it cannot but describe divine truths and commandments in terms of light. Even if, therefore, the lamp of Hanukkah actually signified the light of the Law once again delivered, the path of proof would always be beset, as it must be when metaphor and symbol alone are guides, with uncertainty. We must therefore seek, as we believe that Grätz's theory that the lamp was symbol of the Law admits of vindication, to establish this by evidence of a more material kind.

For the significance given to the Hanukkah-lamp we must, as we have done for its origin, turn to the Hellenic cult supplanted. The cult of Apollo was essentially oracular. "Probably in Apollo no aspect of the concept of deity," observes Wernicke, "had greater significance than that associated with mantic. Especially the fame and glamour of the Pythian oracle and the innate inclination of man to seek to have the future revealed, favoured the development of this feature."[1] The word-oracle was characteristic of him. But very frequently oracles were gained by means of the burning of the offerings. In Thebes the prophecy was yielded *διὰ τῶν ἐμπύρων* (Philoch. frg. 197; Schol. Soph. O.R. 21), and Sophocles therefore speaks of the oracle of Apollo as *μαντεία σποδός*.[2] The signs that were perceived from the burning of the pieces of the sacrifice were the *ἔμπυρα σήματα* (Hesych., *ἔμπυρα τὰ καιόμενα ἱερά*), or these were simply seen in the flame itself.[3] It is Apollo who teaches the Argonaut Idmon, *ἔμπυρα σήματ' ἰδέσθαι* (Apoll. Rhod. i. 145). That the threshold- and oracle-fire cult of Apollo received reinforcement in the Hellenistic age from current Iranian religious thought may be regarded as certain. Both the purposes which such a cult pre-eminently served, apotropaic and oracular, were the purposes which were accomplished by the fire of the Iranian cultus. To the Mazdâ-worshipper fire was a powerful means of averting the influence of demons. Burnings provided the means of procuring oracles. "From the smoke and flames of the fire it was believed the will of the deity could be known. The noise of the flame was his voice speaking to man. Especially in cases of doubt, in questions of right and wrong the inquirer seems to have invoked the oracular decision of the fire."[1]

---

[1] Wernicke ("Ap.," *P.-W.*, col. 11 f.): "Wohl keine Seite des Gottesbegriffs hat in A. grössere Bedeutung gewonnen als die der Mantic, zumeist durch den Ruhm und Glanz des pythischen Orakels und dadurch, dass der dem Menschen innewohnende Trieb, Zukünftiges zu ergründen, die Ausbildung grade dieser Seite begünstigte."

[2] Cf. Wernicke, *ut sup.*, col. 36 f.

[3] Cf. Stengel (*P.-W.*), *Ἔμπυρα (σήματα)*.

There is evidence of opposition in Judaism to this aspect of pagan religion in the period of Hellenic domination, and that in this opposition the Law was regarded on the Jewish side as being the counterpart of this valued element of the heathen cults. When Judas and his followers are preparing themselves, in great trepidation, for the contest with the army Lysias sent against them, 1 M. iii. 48 records, "they spread out the Book of the Law (one of those) concerning which the Gentiles were wont to make search in order to depict upon them the images of their idols" (καὶ ἐξεπέτασαν τὸ βιβλίον τοῦ νόμου, περὶ ὧν ἐξηρεύνων τὰ ἔθνη τοῦ ἐπιγράφειν ἐπ᾽ αὐτῶν τὰ ὁμοιώματα τῶν εἰδώλων αὐτῶν). Without enlarging upon the criticism by Wellhausen (*Nachr. d. Gesellschaft d. Wiss. zu Göttingen*, p. 162) of this passage, that the painting of images on the Scriptures is too childish for belief, that according to 1 M. i. 56 the heathen destroyed confiscated Scriptures by tearing and burning them, that, moreover, the grammatical construction (*βιβλίον . . . περὶ ὧν . . . ἐπ' αὐτῶν*) is broken, we have a very high degree of assurance that the correct text is secured by the omission (so Swete, LXX) in the best MSS. of the words *τοῦ ἐπιγράφειν ἐπ' αὐτῶν*. 1 M. thus informs that "they spread out the Book of the Law for those purposes the heathen inquired of the images of their idols." This reading is supported by 2 M. viii. 23, *παραναγνοὺς τὴν ἱερὰν βίβλον, καὶ δοὺς σύνθημα Θεοῦ Βοηθείας*. The Law was consulted for an oracle or sign. "The victory is the Lord's" (Ps. iii. 8) was the answer received as the Scripture roll was unfolded at this place. Thereupon the Jews engage the enemy. "It is interesting," Wellhausen remarks, "to find the Bible taking the place of the idols" (*loc. cit.*, note 1, p. 162). But we have here an action which, in other circumstances, follows the admonition given by Isa. viii. 19 f. to those who resorted to oracles of the dead, that they should rather consult their God through Tora and Teʿudah. The comparison of these passages of 1 and 2 M. reveals that Judaism was conscious of the danger associated with the pagan oracle-system, and that, rightly interpreting the spirit of Deut. xviii. 14 f., where Moses is represented as prophet, the faithful opposed to that system, there being no prophet raised up to them, the oracle of the Law.

---

[1] Geiger (*Ostiran. Kultur*), p. 253: "Es (das Feuer) ist ihm—ein kräftiges Mittel zum Abwehr der Dämonen"; p. 254: "Aus dem Rauche und den Flammen des Feuers glaubte man zudem den Willen der Gottheit zu erkennen. Sein Rauschen war die Stimme in der sie zu dem Menschen sprach. Insbesondere in zweifelhaften Rechtsfällen scheint man die orakelhafte Entscheidung des Feuers angerufen zu haben."

In the Megillath Taʿanith, the Aramaic festival-chronicle, mention is made of the 3rd of Kislev, when "they removed the signs (*sēmavatha* or *sīmvatha*) from the court" of the temple.[1] The scholion adds that the Greeks had built (בנו) the signs there,[1] and that the victorious Hasmoneans abolished these (במלום) and put them thence. Now the same divergence of opinion reigns regarding these signs, as does concerning the "signs" (אתות) of Ps. lxxiv. 4b: "they have set up their own signs as signs" (Briggs, *Pss.*, vol. ii.).[2] In this psalm, as also in Meg. Taʿan. (cf. Dalman, *Aram. Dialektproben*, 2 ed. p. 43), the reference has been understood as made to military standards. Briggs, who does not esteem the psalm to be Maccabean, is forced to admit glosses by a Maccabean editor who refers to the desecration of the temple in the time of Antiochus, and that verse 4b is such a gloss and reference. He takes the view that the "signs" are not standards of the army, but "religious symbols of the Greeks as a supplanting of the Jewish religion." "Our signs we do not see" (ver. 9a), he believes, belongs to the original text; but the cry, "there is no prophet" (ver. 9b),[3] reflects the glossator's own time "as characterized by the absence alike of miracle and prophecy" (cf. 1 M. iv. 46, ix. 27, xiv. 41). The opinion of Briggs is the more valuable inasmuch as he does not hold, as is very generally held, that the whole psalm is Maccabean.[4]

---

[1] Meg. Taʿan. ix., *Anecd. Oxon.*:
בתלתא בכסלו איתנטלו סימואתא (Dalman, *Dialektproben*: סימותא) מן דרתא.

That the festival-chronicle and the words of Ps. lxxiv. 4b, 9b allude to the same event, the placing of signs in the temple-court in the period before the Maccabean revolt, and that these signs were not the military standards, would seem to be the conclusion that has most justification. The three texts—the chronicle, the scholion, and the psalm—are commentary to one another. That military standards were set in the temple-court is of course not impossible, but in time of peace they would more naturally have been kept in the acra, and in time of defeat the soldiers of Antiochus would hardly have left their standards behind them. When the temple was retaken and cleansed the Greek garrison retained the acra. Dalman (*ut sup.*, p. 43) perceives this difficulty relating to the storing of the standards in the temple-court. He thinks the standards or signs mentioned by the Chronicle were in the Antonia, “which could be reckoned as belonging to the outer court of the temple,” and that the situation reflected in the Chronicle is that of *circa* A.D. 26 (Jos. *Ant.* xviii. 3. 1; *B.J.* ii. 9. 2–3), when Pilate was constrained to remove the military ensigns with their effigies from Jerusalem to Cesarea. But the scholion to Meg. Taʿan. has every mark of being an authentic tradition when it records that the signs (*sīmvaoth*) were “*built*” within the temple-court (בעזרה) by the Greeks. Derenbourg (*Essai*, p. 62) shows that the interpretation, military emblems, does not harmonize with the use of the verb “built” by the scholion, and thinks that the סימואתא were probably the *βωμοί* placed in the agora (2 M. x. 2), which he suggests was under the portico outside the balustrade of the temple, or that they were “the stones of defilement” (1 M. iv. 43–46) ranged along the border of the ancient altar for the purpose of sacrificing victims.[1] This identification of the “signs,” derived from the statements of 1 and 2 M., may or may not be granted. But it would seem clear that objects of stone, *βωμοί*, built in the temple-court are intended. That these *βωμοί* were small altars would further appear from an observation which Derenbourg (*ibid.*, p. 445, note 14) cites from R. Johanan (Abodah Zarah, 53b), "a bimus (*βωμός*) is made of one stone, an altar (מזבח) of several." And when, in Psalm lxxiv., the presence of the signs (אתות) the heathen had set up makes the author bewail the absence of any prophet of Jahveh, we must conclude that the reference is to the same "semawatha" to which Meg. Taʿan. bears testimony, and that they were connected with the pagan oracles.

---

[1] Schol. to Meg. Taʿan. ix.: שבנו [שם] יוונים סימואות (בעזרה . . . .

[2] Ps. lxxiv. 4b: שמו אותתם אתות.

[3] Ps. lxxiv. 9b: אין עוד נביא.

[4] Bertholet, *Grundriss d. theol. Wiss.*, p. 210, places Ps. lxxiv. in the Maccabean period, stating that "sich keine andere Abfassungszeit mit auch nur annähernd so guten Gründen ausfindig machen lässt." Cf. Bousset, *Rel. d. Jud.*, 3rd ed. pp. 9, 10: "Fast allgemein gelten Ps. xliv. lxxiv. lxxix. lxxxiii. als makkabäisch."

---

[1] Cf. Derenbourg, *Essai*, p. 61: “Quant aux simôth ou bimôth comme il faudrait peut-être lire, ce sont probablement les *βωμοί* ou autels, ou les pierres de souillure (*οἱ λίθοι τοῦ μιασμοῦ*) qu'on avait dressées en dehors de l'ancien autel afin d'y immoler des victimes”; p. 62: “L' *ἀγορά* est probablement le marché ou la place sous le portique en dehors de la balustrade.”

In the conceptions of our period as to the functions of a prophet a palpable change has taken place. Though heathen practice in securing oracles met with opposition, those such as heathen deities gave are awaited, and there is an approach, or a return, to the heathen ideal. The prophets whom 1 M. iv. 46, xiv. 41 (cf. *ό* and *θ*, Dan. iii. 38; 1 M. ix. 27) await, are of the type who could give an oracle as to what should be done with the fragments of the defiled altar, or concerning the status and titles of the Hasmonean Simon. For Sirach the story of Saul consulting the witch of Endor (xlvi. 20) is no longer repelling.[1] The prophet Isaiah becomes a seer and revealer of the remotest future, declaring "hidden things before they came to pass" (Sir. xlviii. 25). Indication of a change of emphasis in the idea of the office of prophet is seen already in 2 Chron. xxix. 25. Here the arrangements for the temple-ceremonies are the commandment of the Lord "by his prophets."[1] The great prophets had spoken burning words against the cultus, but now prophetic authority is retrospectively given to it. With this phase of thought must be connected the fact that the prophecy which Israel's prophets had represented had been outgrown.[2] Its religious-content, the doctrine of a retribution in the present life for individuals and nations as punishment for sin, had been found unsatisfactory and contradicted experience. Israel, who had passed through the tribulation of the Exile, was not more guilty than her neighbours. The basis of the old prophetic religion was thus undermined, and therewith the concept of prophet itself underwent change. Of necessity inner spiritual experience must have been operative. But the historical situation, the Persian and Hellenic domination, cannot have failed to make contribution to the conception of prophet which became current in Judaism. It is as in this situation and its pressure we must read the protest which (Deutero)-Zechariah xiii. 1 f. makes against the encroachment of heathen prophecy and its uniting with Jahvism (ver. 3).

---

[1] Cf. Fascher, *προφήτης*, usw., p. 146, Anm. 1: "Als besonders merkwürdig wird endlich hervorgehoben, dass Samuel noch nach seinem Tode aus der Erde geweissagt habe (46. 20). Hier wird an der Szene von Endor gar kein Anstoss mehr genommen, und nicht bedacht, dass Saul sich schuldig machte, als er zu einer Zauberin ging."

While the conception of prophet, after the purer flame of prophecy had flickered out, shows an approach to the heathen idea, there is evidence that the danger with which this fact was fraught in the sphere of practice was felt and was obviated. In 1 M. we see the Jews before the battle consulting the Law in circumstances where the heathen would consult the oracles. In Psalm lxxiv. it is the guidance of the prophet of Jahveh which is the Jewish equivalent of the heathen "signs," of the semawatha which (Meg. Taʿan. ix.) had been provided for use in the temple-court. Related with this picture of the times is the emergence of the thought that the great prophets of former days had been guardians of the Law, and the appearance of the expression "the Law and the Prophets" as signifying a definite unity.[1] In 2 M. ii. 3, Jeremiah is described as having warned the exiles not to yield to idolatry, but to hold to the Law. In 2 M. xv. 9 Judas comforts his men "out of the Law and the prophets." Sirach is not conscious of the "absolute difference between the teaching which by his own admission was nothing more than an enforcement of the principles of the Law of Moses, and the old creative prophecy of Isaiah or Jeremiah."[2] From the time when in Deut. (xviii. 15 f.) Moses the Law-giver is given the character of the ideal prophet, the process of thought was begun which led to the *νόμος* and the *προφήτης* becoming this unity. While the prophet admonishes to the obedience of the Law, the Law itself assumed prophetic and oracular virtue. As having such, the *βιβλίον τοῦ νόμου* became the natural means of opposition to the heathen oracles. Fascher in his philological and historical study of Greek and Hebrew prophecy draws attention to the interesting parallel—"As the Greeks made the old *χρησμολόγοι* and Sibyls seers of the far future, collected their *λόγοι* and interpreted them by exegetes, so in later Judaism the Scriptures of the prophets became a collection of *ῥήματα κυρίου*, the fulfilment of which is yet to be. The place for the living revelation was taken by the inspired and holy book, a process which Christianity repeated."[1] If the result in the end was that the religion of the book took the place in Judaism of the living revelation, it is also true that it was the rise of the doctrine of the inspiration of the book which prevented revelation from being cast in lower forms. The beginning of the process we must view as due to the resistance to heathen mantic which drew Judaism to oppose to it the Law and the prophets as oracular unity. If, then, the Hanukkah-lamp is the emblem of the suppression of that cult-form, associated by the heathen with a deity who was essentially oracular, it may naturally be regarded as a symbol[2] of the Law.

---

[1] Fascher, *ibid.*, p. 145: "Wenn nun die Bezeichnung 'προφήτης' auf Gad und Nathan sich zurückbeziehen sollte . . . so ist diees Auffassung ungeschichtlich."

[2] Bousset, *Rel. d. Jud.*, 3rd ed. p. 470: "Die eine Tatsache (ergibt sich) mit grosser Deutlichkeit, dass die prophetische Religion überwunden ist."

---

[1] Fascher, p. 145: "Gesetz und Propheten sind bereits eine feste Grösse."

[2] Robertson Smith, *O.T. in the Jewish Church*, p. 159.

The small single-stone altars built in the temple-court, the *signs* which awakened in the faithful band of Hasidim the bitter thought that they had no prophets, it may be permitted to attempt to characterize more expressly, though it is sufficient if it be made probable that they served oracular uses. That these altars were for victims, as Derenbourg suggests, is not so likely as that they were for θυμιάματα, for offerings of a bloodless kind. That these βωμοί were in honour of various divinities may also be assumed. The "semawatha" of Meg. Taʿan. ix. suggest the practice of empyromantic, the divination from the "empura semata," from the sparks or flames of the material consumed on the altar, a rite indeed which Bouché-Leclercq thinks had its home in the Orient.[1] This was a special feature of the Apollo-cult, the oracle-seats of which were numerous in Asia Minor,[2] when an oracle by technical means was desired. Libanomantic (λιβανομαντεία), the divination from the smoke of incense, is but a form of the same practice. When Josephus tells us (*Ant.* xiii. x. 3; *B.J.* i. 2. 8) that John Hyrkanus discoursed with God, had the gift of prophecy, and was cognizant of all things that were to come, that in particular the revelation of the success of his sons in battle came to him when as priest he was offering incense (cf. St. Luke i. 9–20), we see trace of the belief that the employment of technique aided revelation. The account has its setting not only chronologically, but spiritually, in the period of Jewish history to which it refers.

---

[1] Fascher, *ut sup.*, p. 152: "Wie die Griechen die alten χρησμολόγοι und Sibyllen zu Sehern der fernsten Zukunft machten, ihre 'λόγοι' sammelten und durch Exegeten deuten liessen, so werden im späteren Judentum die Schriften der Propheten zu einer Sammlung von ῥήματα κυρίου, deren Erfüllung noch aussteht. An Stelle lebendiger Verkündigung tritt das Buch, das man als inspiriert und heilig hält und ständig ausdeutet. Dieser Prozess wiederholt sich im Christentum."

[2] Sirach xlviii. 1 says of the prophecy of Elijah: "καὶ ἀνέστη Ἠλίας προφήτης ὡς πῦρ καὶ ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ ὡς λαμπὰς ἐκαίετο."

II

The theory of Grätz must further be viewed in the light of that ever increasing tendency which Jewish interpretation of the festivals shows, and of the literature which reflects the struggle with Hellenism. Whatever might have been the origin of the Jewish religious institutions, a connexion with the Law, or more generally with the covenant existing between Jahveh and His people, sought to establish itself. The Sabbath becomes a sign of the covenant between God and Israel (Ex. xxxi. 13), the Passover (Ex. xiii. 9) a sign to them that the " Law be in thy mouth." In recognition of this tendency the statement appears true that "what makes the festivals festivals is not any human selection of them that attached to the process of nature, but the institution by the God of the Covenant" (*Herzog R.E.*, "Feste der alten Hebräer").[1] Pentecost becomes in the Maccabean period a memorial of the covenant with Noah (Jub. vi. 15 f.) and with Abraham (Jub. xiv. 18 f.). Later it commemorates the law-giving on Sinai (cf. Jub. i. 1 f.). In the Book of Jubilees the festival of Booths, which already (Lev. xxiii. 43) had been given significance as a memorial of Israel's redemption, receives implicitly, if not explicitly, covenantal character. The festival is first celebrated by Abraham, as God's promise to him of offspring is fulfilled at the well of the oath (Jub. xvi. 10 f.). In time this process is completed, and what was doubtless felt to be lacking was supplied by appending to Booths the festival of Simhath Torah on the 23rd of Tishri.[2] As with the festivals so with the Day of Atonement, the fast *κατ' ἐξοχήν*. Tradition (cf. *Mishnah Surenh.* to Taʿan. iv. 8) affixed to it the giving of the last tables of the Law on that day. In contrast with these festivals and days which were brought within the ambit of reference to the Law, Hanukkah, from the beginning of its Jewish history, stands under the shadow of the cleaned temple, the reinstitution of the cultus and of the Law. It could claim, as none of the other festivals could, to be a sign or memorial of the Law.

---

[1] *Histoire de la divination dans l'antiquité,* i. p. 178: " L'empyromancie ou pyromancie . . . parait bien etre venue de l'orient " (cf. note 2: " Un oracle pyromantique," Procop. Bell, *Pers.* ii. 24, in Persia); p. 179: " Les rites empyromantiques se sont formés autour des autels, et les premières observations ont eu pour objet la couleur, le grésillement, les changements de forme, les exsudations des chairs posées sur le brassier, et accessoirement, l'éclat de la flamme ou la nuance et la direction de la fumée."

[2] Cf. Wernicke, " Ap.," in *P.-W.*, col. 13 f.; Fascher, *ut sup.*, p. 38.

---

[1] "Was die Feste zu Festen macht, ist doch nicht irgendwie an das Naturleben anknüpfende menschliche Wahl, sondern die Stiftung des Bundesgottes."

[2] "Vielleicht mit Beziehung auf 2 Chron. vii. 10" ("Feste der späteren Juden," Oehler, *Herz. R.E.*, 2nd ed.). The practice in Babylonia, where Booths lasted nine days, of completing on 23rd Tishri the one-year cycle of the Pentateuch-reading, a custom from which Dalman (*Herzog-Hauck R.E.*, "Synagogaler Gottesdienst") derives the festival of Law-rejoicing, may itself have based on 2 Chron. vii. 10.

This does not mean that any part of its ritual need reflect that fact. But where there is a transforming of ritual and reinterpretation it may seem probable, in view of the above-mentioned tendency, that expression was given to the idea of the Law.

The literature which records the resistance of the faithful Jews who opposed Hellenization shows that "the Law" was the watchword of the conflict. 2 M. is prolific of statements which view the revolt from this standpoint. The Epitomist reports that Jason of Cyrene had told of the Maccabean rising, the freeing of the city, and of the restoration of the laws which had been about to be abolished (*καὶ τοὺς μέλλοντας καταλύεσθαι νόμους ἐπανορθῶσαι*, ii. 22). The laws had been well kept, it is stated, in the peaceful time of Onias (iii. 1), who was zealous for them (iv. 2). Jason the high-priest abolished the customs (iv. 11) which were in accordance with the Law, and introduces customs which were contrary to the Law. Antiochus commissions an old Athenian to compel the Jews to depart from the laws (vi. 1). The seven brothers chose death rather than eat swine's flesh and thus transgress the paternal laws (vii. 2, 37). Judas raises the rebellion, resolved to die for Law and Fatherland (viii. 21), and the battle in which he is successful against Nikanor is vouchsafed the Jews because they were obedient to the Law. The letters of chapter xi. give official authority to the Jews to possess their own laws (ver. 24) and the customs of their food-laws (ver. 31). Threatened by the army of Eupator and Lysias, Judas summons the people to prayer that God would help them who were in danger of being robbed of "their Law, their country, and their holy temple" (xiii. 10, 11).

The testimony of 1 M., when it is necessary for the author to represent this religious aspect of the struggle, is corroborative. Attracted by Hellenic customs and mode of life, the Jews (i. 15) became apostate from the holy covenant, forgetting the Law ὥστε ἐπιλαθέσθαι τοῦ νόμου (49). The very beginning of the movement is the stirring call of Mattathias, "Let everyone that is zealous for the Law and that would maintain the covenant come forth after me" (ii. 27). This picture of the chief attack on the part of the Syrian government is supplemented by certain portions of the Book of Jubilees. In prophetic vision the angel of the Presence foretells the violation of the Law in respect of the breach of the commandment of circumcision (xv. 34): "And there will be great wrath from the Lord against the children of Israel because they have forsaken His covenant . . . in as much as they do not observe the ordinance of this law; for they have treated their members like the Gentiles, so that they may be removed and rooted out of the land." This can refer only to one period in Israel's history, the time of Epiphanes (cf. Meyer, *Ursprung*, Bd. ii. p. 170). So too Jub. xxiii. 19 is a description of pre-Maccabean times: "And they shall strive one with another, the young with the old, and the old with the young, the poor with the rich, the lowly with the great and the beggar with the prince on account of the Law and the covenant; for they have forgotten commandment and covenant, and feasts and months and Sabbaths and Jubilees and all judgments." "We clearly see from this passage," says Meyer (*ut sup.*, p. 171, note 2), "that the struggle in behalf of the Law arises amid the lower strata of the people, and that the higher classes are renegade."[1] The opposition that arises with the obscure

---

[1] Meyer, *loc. cit.*: "Deutlich tritt hervor, dass der Kampf für das Gesetz von den unteren Schichten des Volkes ausgeht, während die höheren abtrünnig werden."

Hasidim at length prevails, "and in those days the children will begin to study the laws, and to seek the commandments, and to return to the path of righteousness" (ver. 26). The Damascus-text (Charles, *Apoc.* ii., Fragments of a Zadokite work), if it belong, as Meyer (*Ursprung*, Bd. ii. pp. 47, 172 f.) holds, to the time of Jason's high-priesthood, confirms that the emphasis on the Law which we find in 2 M. is not due to later Pharisaic reflection but is a truthful representation of the main issue in the religious conflict. This writing, which tells of the congregation of the "new covenant" (ix. 28) who in the period of apostasy migrate to the territory of Damascus, where, as chosen remnant, they might abide by God's precepts, exhibits a very significant casuistic development of the Law. The persecution by Antiochus had not yet broken out. The renegades from Israel "with a tongue of blasphemies" have "opened the mouth against the statutes of the covenant of God, saying: They are not established" (vii. 12 f.) (cf. 1 M. i. 11). Men arose who "led Israel astray" and spoke "rebellion against the commandments of God through Moses," and who "prophesied a lie to turn away Israel from God" (viii. 1, 2). But the people of the covenant have "dug a well of many waters" (v. 3): "The well is the Law and they who digged it are the penitents of Israel" (viii. 6) who went forth from Judah to the land of Damascus. The breach of the covenant and its ordinances is the charge levelled by these faithful against their nation. Their emigration from Judah is the loyal and bitter protest which was soon to swell into the battle-cry and action of Mattathias which rallied Israel round the Law. But in the meantime they themselves, the Covenanters, are the "House of the Law" (ix. 35; cf. Charles, *Apoc.* ii. *ad loc.*).

Viewing the Maccabean revolt as the reaction of Judaism, in the sign of the Law, against pagan religious influence, we may now bring the question of the significance of the Hanukkah-lamp into relation with two rites by which the Law was symbolized—the placing of the Mezuzah and the wearing of phylacteries. Sab. 22, a, in answer to the question where the Hanukkah-lamp is to be placed records that the Halakah is, that it is to be set on the left side of the door-opening so that the Hanukkah-lamp is on the left and the Mezuzah on the right.[1] We are not entitled to see in this prescription anything more than a statement of the location of the lamp, even although possibly there may be deposited in this Halakah a trace of the significance that had been given to the "Lights." But both the period in which the Mezuzah was introduced and the origin of the custom are of importance to the consideration of Grätz's hypothesis. If the Mezuzah, the metal cylinder containing a parchment roll inscribed with Deut vi. 4–9, xi. 13–21, is substitute (Stade, *Bib. Th. d. A.T.*, p. 121) for the Teraphim, and owes its position at the door to the position once held by the Teraphim (that is, if the *Elohim*, Ex. xxi. 6, be the Teraphim), we have a similar pre-history for the Mezuzah to that we have traced for the Hanukkah-lamp. The parallel between the two customs would be the more striking inasmuch as Teraphim were associated with the giving of oracles. Should, however, the Mezuzah be a transformation of the cult-mark cut upon the door-post of the house (Stade, *ib.*, pp. 121, 146; *Z.A.W.* xiv. pp. 308–318), as the tephillin or phylacteries may be regarded as the refinement of the practice of bearing cult-marks (cuttings, tattooings) on hand and forehead, the rite of the Mezuzah is analogous to the rite of the lamp. A mark with apotropaic virtue, a threshold-mark has been reformed and re-interpreted.

---

[1] Sab. 22, a (cf. Maimon. *Hilkoth Meg. wa-Han.*, iv. 7): רב אחא בריה דרבא אמר מימין רב שמואל מדפתי אמר משמאל והילכתא משמאל כדי שתהא נר חנוכה משמאל ומזוזה מימין:

Stade regards the passages, Deut. vi. 8 f., xi. 18 f., on which the custom of the Mezuzah and phylacteries is based, to be a figurative expression of the command to retain God's statutes in memory, and the introduction of the custom itself, as suppression of the old cult-signs, to have taken place after the Exile.[1] Kennedy (*H.B.D.*, "Phylacteries, Frontlets") shows that the language of Deut. vi. 8 f., xi. 18 f., often interpreted literally (cf. Driver, *Deut.*, p. 93), must be held to be as figurative as the references to signs and frontlets in Ex. xiii. 9–16 are usually admitted to be. For the date of the introduction of phylacteries, and with them we must include the Mezuzah, he takes as index of a *terminus a quo* passages in Prov. i.–ix. (*circa* 300 B.C.), namely, iii. 3, i. 9, vi. 21, vii. 3, which are similar in character to the verses of Deuteronomy and are manifestly figurative. The *terminus ad quem* is supplied by the letter of Aristeas (Wendland, in Kautzsch, *Pseudep.*, 96–63 B.C.)[2] where, § 158–159, the "fringes," the Mezuzah (τὰ λόγια) on doors and gates, and the hand-tephillin are mentioned as being commanded by Moses. Thus the period 250–100 B.C. would seem to be the time in which those symbols of the Law made their appearance. Conjecturally, Kennedy favours the time of Simon and Hyrkanus, the years 140–105, within which the Pharisees acquired influence and were able to impose certain observances (Jos. *Ant.* xiii. 16. 2).

---

[1] Stade, *Z.A.W.*, "Das Kainzeichen," xiv. p. 311 f.: "Deut. vi. 8, xi. 18 begegnet uns als bildlicher Ausdruck für das Gebot, Gottes Gebote treu im Gedächtnis zu bewahren"; p. 313: "Es scheine, dass diese Entwicklung, die zur Verdrängung des alten Cultzeichen geführt hat, erst nach dem Exile eingesetzt hat. Im Exile dürfte die Sitte noch allgemein verbreitet gewesen sein, sich die Cultzeichen einzuritzen. Nur unter dieser Voraussetzung wird der Vers Jes. 44. 6 verständlich."

[2] Bousset's date for the Aristeas-letter (40 B.C.–A.D. 30; cf. *Rel. d. Jud.*, p. 27 f.) might affect to some extent, but not appreciably, Kennedy's conclusions, for the letter is not urging the authority of Moses for recent institutions, and Bousset cautions against moving too far from 40 B.C. for its composition.

Taking the period 250–100 B.C. as that in which Mezuzah and phylactery appeared, we are confronted with the institution of the Hanukkah-lamp and the institution of the Mezuzah and phylacteries at a relatively approximate date. It is "the period which witnessed the growth of that more strict and literal observance of the Torah which is associated with the rise to power and influence of the sect of the Hasidæans" (Kennedy, *ibid.*). Within this section of time we see the Law being consulted and employed in a manner that was in conscious opposition to the oracles of the heathen. Also when we learn, 2 M. xii. 40, that supporters of Judas wore beneath their clothing heathen amulets or images, ἱερώματα, which belong to the category of φυλακτήρια (cf. *Parolen-Götter und-Heroen*, col. 1645, Roscher), we may believe, that besides the growth of a more literal interpretation of Scripture and the purpose of transforming ancient but offensive *Hebrew* customs being the origin of the Jewish phylacteries, the institution of these was aimed against the danger visualized in the wearing of amulets and the bearing of cult-marks (στίγματα) by Hellenized Jews (3 M. ii. 29; Philo, *de Monarch*, i. 8; Mangey, ii. 220; Deissmann, *Bible Studies to Gal.* vi. 7, p. 346 f.). Even in his day, Philo (*loc. cit.*) can complain of Jews who were not ashamed to imprint on their bodies the indelible signs of heathen cults.

When the Mezuzah and the phylacteries, as signs suppressing what was felt to be incompatible with Jahvism or hostile to it, were made symbols of the Law, they surrendered the element of pure symbol in having their meaning revealed by written Scripture passages enclosed within them. The Hanukkah-lamp on the other hand had no such aid to its interpretation. But in the reaction in defence of the Law as we see this in the literature which reflects the period before the Maccabean revolt, in the growing tendency to apply the idea of the Law or Covenant to the festivals, in the creation of symbols of the Law in an age in which Hanukkah holds a governing position, we have the basis of a strong presumption that the symbol which was fashioned at the time of the rehabilitation of the Jewish legal system, was an expression of this same central idea of Judaism.

III

The theory of Grätz that the Hanukkah-lamp signified the Law has been considered from the standpoint of the cult which the ritual of the lamp suppressed, and also in connexion with the growing Jewish reaction, with the Law as its watchword and as creator of symbols, against pagan rite and custom. But Grätz's hypothesis which appeared to have an element of naïveté when based solely upon the terminology of poets, can now be set in a context of theological conceptions, which, in the period of Judaism with which we are concerned, had creative influence and made deep impression. Whatever Persian influence may have infiltrated into Judaism previously, in the second pre-Christian century there appear in Judaism important religious doctrines in which the Iranian dualistic ideas of the world-government have central place.[1] The teaching of the two kingdoms of good and evil, God and Beliar, angels and demons, has established itself, and therewith, from the same source, the belief in a resurrection of the body and in a world-judgment embracing the destiny of individuals. With these teachings come also conceptions of fire and light, which may be spoken of as a theology of light,[2] and this attaches, as something fundamentally new, to the two chief elements of Jewish religion, its eschatology and the Law.

Söderblom, who stresses that in Judaism we have not a borrowing pure and simple from Mazdaism, but a ripening of germs of belief through contact with it, admits that in the Book of Daniel Mazdæan influence upon the doctrine of the resurrection is not improbable.[3] As example of Jewish independence he points out that in Mazdaism the resurrection is of all the dead, while in Daniel this is limited to "some" (xii. 2). But in the realm of thought borrowings *en bloc* must be very rare. And while it is certain that the harsh experiences of Israel's history, the sufferings and the persecution of the pious, the failure of the older form of the doctrine of retribution, did contribute the *besoin vital de religion* for such a belief in resurrection, yet the correspondence between the Jewish and Iranian thought of resurrection and judgment, even extending, as Bousset shows, to agreement in apparent inconsistencies,[1] is too great to leave room for doubt as to the doctrine's source. When, therefore, we take regard of those concepts of light which, in Daniel's description (xii. 3) of the future life, are so essential a part, the picture of those "wise" who "shine as the brightness of the firmament," and of those who turn many to righteousness who will be as "the stars for ever and ever," we must conclude that these ideas penetrated into Judaism with the doctrine to which they belong. They certainly represent a new element in Judaism. Gunkel (in Kautzsch, *Pseudep.*, Bd. ii. p. 375—4 Ezra vii. 97) believes that the language of Dan. xii. 3; 4 Ezra vii. 97, etc., shows that the Jewish belief in a resurrection is derived from a religion whose Gods were stars. But in Dan. xii. 3 and in kindred passages such as Enoch civ. 2 ("but now ye shall shine as the lights of heaven," etc.), xxxix. 7 ("and all the righteous and elect before Him shall be strong (shine) as fiery lights"), cviii. 14 ("And they shall see those that were born in darkness led into darkness, while the righteous shall be resplendent"), though there is probability of influence from Chaldean astral religion, the inner connexion of thought is with that religion in which the antithesis σκότος and φῶς was inherent, organic particularly to the belief in a future life, and in which the soul of man was μοῖρα τοῦ φωτός or simply φῶς.[1] Reference has already been made to the world-judgment scene in Dan. vii. 9 f. and to the difference between the metaphors of fire as purifying agent in the older Jewish eschatology, and the concept it now makes its own of the flaming throne of the Ancient of Days, the burning wheels, and the stream of fire issuing from before Him. Here fire is no longer a mere comparison (cf. Meyer, *Ursprung*, Bd. ii. p. 198). In the similar description which, later, 4 Ezra xiii. 2 f. gives of the stream of fire coming forth from the mouth of Him who has the similitude of a man, of the flaming breath from His lips, of the storm of sparks from His tongue, Reitzenstein sees indeed agreement with, but not derivation from the Book of Daniel, but rather a fuller drawing from the Iranian conceptions from which Daniel had drawn.[2] With the appearance of the doctrine of resurrection, there arose with it necessarily a deeper philosophy and conception of "life" as eternal. Formerly for Judaism "life" had been the highest earthly *summum bonum*; now in Apocalyptic it becomes an eternal, immortal existence in heaven (cf. Gunkel on 4 Ezra vii. 129—

---

[1] Cf. Meyer, *Ursprung*, Bd. ii. p. 95 f., p. 106: "Ganz anders ist das Bild, wenn wir von da zu den oben besprochenen, aus den Kreisen der Frommen stammenden Schriften aus der Zeit um 200 v. Chr. wenden. Hier steht der Dualismus beherrschend im Mittelpunkt der Weltanschauung und der Religion."

[2] Reitzenstein, *Die Hellen. Myst.-Rel.*, p. 292: "Scheint doch die Lichttheologie selbst, wenigstens in ihrer späteren, ausgeprägten Form, erst aus dem Iranischen ins Judentum gedrungen."

[3] Söderblom, *La Vie future d'après le Mazdéism*, p. 316: "Quant à l'influence mazdéenne qui n'est pas invraisemblable en ce cas, il nous faut . . . remarquer qu'en tout état de cause ce n'est pas un emprunt pur et simple, mais une action organique." Cf. p. 320: "Il n'y a qu'un point capital où le judaisme a pu subir une certaine influence par le contact du mazdéisme, c'est dans l'idée de la résurrection. Mais cette idée même a une origine juive et s'est developpée d'une manière indépendante." Cf. Bousset, *R. d. Jud.*, p. 507 f., for criticism of Söderblom's emphasis of differences in Jewish and Persian eschatology. Bousset (*l.c.*, p. 509, note 3) points to the new cosmological element in Jewish apocalyptic, joined adventitiously (notdürftig) to Jewish Messianic thought. Cf. also Reitzenstein, *Iranische Erlös.-Myst.*, p. 122: "Die unlösliche Verbindung von Kosmologie und Soteriologie gibt der iranischen Lehre das Gepräge des ursprünglicheren" (Anm. 3).

---

[1] Bousset, *Rel. d. Jud.*, p. 511: "Es kommt noch eine weitere Beobachtung hinzu. In der jüdischen Eschatologie wird neben der allgemeinen Auferstehung der Toten am Ende der Tage, eine Vergeltung unmittelbar nach dem Tode jedes Einzelnen vorausgesetzt. Die beiden Gedanken scheinen sich gegenseitig aufzuheben. Dennoch halten sie sich nebeneinander. Für dieses Nebeneinandergehen zweier ganz verschiedener jenseitiger Vergeltungsvorstellungen bietet wieder keine andere Eschatologie ein Gegenstück als die persische."

---

[1] Cf. Reitzenstein, *Ir. Erlös. Myst.*, pp. 135, 136. Cf. Bousset, *R. d. J.*, p. 511, note 1. For the mingling of Iranian and Chaldean elements, cf. Bousset, *ibid.*, p. 522 f.: "Die Religion des hellenistischen Zeitalters schlechthin war die mit iranischen Bestandteilen durchsetzte chaldäische Gestirnreligion."

[2] Reitzenstein, *ibid.*, pp. 122, 123: "Ist sie (die Schilderung iv. Ezr. xiii. 2 f.) aber iranischer Herkunft, so folgt ohne weiteres, dass das Bild des Esrabuches zwar an Daniel schliesst aber nicht aus ihm stammt. Es bietet in voller Ausführung die Anschauung aus der das Danielbuch nur einen Zug beiläufig übernommen hat."

Kautzsch, *Pseudep.*, Bd. ii.). With this teaching there was united, in Iranian religion, the idea of light as the divine essence, as the nature of the inner man, and as the portion of the blessed. This conception of light, too, which from the beginning is almost interchangeable with that of life, comes in Judaism to fuller and varied expression (cf. 1 Enoch i. 8, xxxviii. 2, 4, l. 1, lviii. 3–6, xcii. 4; Bar. Ap. xlviii. 50). Thus it would seem that from the second century B.C. onwards, conceptions of fire and light, though natural at all times when employed for figures and symbols of spiritual truth, had secured in Jewish thought a particular dogmatic character.

Now it can be shown that this theology of light did not confine itself to the eschatological sphere, but attached itself to the Law. Already in the Testaments of the XII. Patriarchs, a writing which Meyer (*Ursprung*, Bd. ii. p. 44) thinks may date from the end of the third century B.C., and in which dualistic thought is deep and strong, we find not only the contrasts God and Beliar (Sim. v. 3), the Spirit of Truth and the Spirit of Untruth (Jud. xx.), Darkness and Light (Jos. xx.), but also the Law of the Lord and the works of Beliar have as their antitheses *φῶς* and *σκότος* (Lev. xix.; cf. Naph. ii. 6, 10, etc.). In Test. XII. these contrasts of the good and evil Powers as darkness and light appear to have not merely a symbolical but a metaphysical character such as they receive in the Fourth Gospel (cf. Bousset, *R. d. J.*, p. 335, note 3). But we are brought farther in our inquiry as to the conception of the Law as Light through the consideration of another important element in Jewish religion, namely, the teaching concerning Wisdom. Of the figure of Wisdom in Prov., Sirach, Sap. Sol., 2 Enoch, Bousset says that " it emerges so suddenly in Jewish literature and so mysteriously, that we may at once conclude that it is of alien origin."[1] He would equate Wisdom with Armaiti, whom Plutarch (*de Is. et Os.* 47) calls *σοφία*, one of the six divine beings Ahuramazda created. Eduard Meyer (Bd. ii. p. 105), on the other hand, observes in Wisdom a concept that has its parallel in the archangels of Zoroastrian religion, but thinks that there is no occasion to speak of influence from this direction. It is a plant he believes that grew on Jewish soil, and it is not necessary to conceive of it as even ripened by contact with Iranian beliefs. The personifications of the Holy Spirit and Wisdom did not grow, in Jewish theology, into independent figures, as in the Iranian religion, or as did in Judaism the devil and angels, but remained half theological, half poetic conceptions, gaining at length in Christianity more concrete form as the Spirit and the Word. Especially in the complete absence of a dualism in the Wisdom-literature, Meyer sees support for his view that in Wisdom there is no Iranian element. For since it is the preparation for conflict with Ahriman which leads to Ahuramazda creating the archangels, other spiritual beings, and then the phenomenal world, this dualism is fundamental to the religious setting in which these angels appear.

Now while it can be admitted that in the Wisdom-literature Wisdom is a half theological, half poetical idea, Gressmann points out that in Prov. ix. the dualism is quite manifest, and that where it is absent in this literature, this absence is the very mark of Wisdom being a strange and foreign element there.[2]

---

[1] Bousset, *loc. cit.* p. 520: "Ihre Gestalt taucht in der späteren jüdischen Literatur so plötzlich und so rätselhaft auf, dass wir von vorneherein auf einen fremdartigen Ursprung schliessen dürfen."

[2] Gressmann, *Zeitschr. für Kirchengeschichte*, xli., 1922, p. 173: "Es ist natürlich zuzugeben, dass der Spruchliteratur der Dualismus fehlt; aber das beweist nur, dass die Gestalt der Weisheit der jüdischen Spruchliteratur im letzten Grunde fremd ist. Es kommt ja noch

Gressmann identifies Wisdom with the Persian *daēna*, the personified "Religion" or "Belief,"[1] who has an evil counterpart (*höllisches Gegenstück*) corresponding to Foolishness in Prov. ix. Armaiti, Piety or Pious-intention, has no such counterpart, but there could be a certain approach on the part of the two beings, Daēna and Armaiti, to one another. When Piety (the Fear of the Lord) is the *beginning* of Wisdom, this approach appears revealed. Pious-intention is indeed the beginning of Religion or Belief. Daēna and Armaiti are kindred but separate figures. In Prov. ix. Wisdom and Foolishness both are depicted as sitting on a high place, having prepared a meal and enticing man: Wisdom, to life and health; Foolishness, to death. In Prov. viii. 22 f. Wisdom was created by God before the world; she is with Him daily as His delight, regarding His works with joy, rejoicing in the children of man. She is almost pictured as Jahveh's daughter. In Sirach xiv. 20 f., li. 13 f., she is a noble and tender woman, whom he who is desirous of her seeks to know and possess, "going forth after her like a spy" (xiv. 22), peering into her window (ver. 23). When he has found her (Wisdom-Law), "she will meet him as a mother, and as a youthful wife she will receive him" (xv. 2). She is from eternity with God, enthroned "in the

---

ein zweiter schroffer Gegensatz hinzu: Die Spruchliteratur ist ihrem innersten Wesen nach profan und unfromm, wenn auch bisweilen die 'Frömmigkeit' als der 'Anfang aller Weisheit' bezeichnet wird; die Weisheit als Hypostase dagegen ist eine Gestalt des Glaubens." "Der Dualismus ist in Prov. 9 ganz klar ausgesprochen, da stehen Weisheit und Torheit einander gegenüber."

[1] Reitzenstein translates daēna by "self" (*Ich*, Person, *Selbst*) in Yasht xxii. 1–36 (see text on p. 30, *Iran. Erlös. Myst.*). Gressmann (*ut sup.*, p. 158) says that while daēna is the better "I" or "Self" of the pious one, there is no reason to depart from the translation "Religion" (Religion, Glaube, cf. p. 174) in Yasht xxii. There the Virgin answers the question regarding her nature, "I am thy Belief": "Wo es (d. h. das Wort daēna) ins Aramäische als persisches Fremdwort übergegangen ist, hatte es sicher den Sinn von 'Glaube.'"

high places" (xxiv. 4), and makes her abode in Zion (xxiv. 10). Sap. Sol. represents her as "beheld of them that love her" (vi. 12), as "a reflection of eternal light, and a spotless mirror of the working of God and an image of His goodness" (vii. 26). She is fairer than the sun, and surpasses the stars in light (vii. 29). Immortality is the gift of living with and of kinship with her (viii. 16 f.).

Although in the Wisdom-literature the personification of Wisdom is a theological and poetic expression, it would seem that, with Bousset, Gressmann, and Reitzenstein (cf. *Ir. Erl. Myst.*, p. 240 f.), we must look for the source of the conception of Wisdom where the personification is primary and real. In the Iranian religion the daēna is the reflection or double of the soul. In Yasht xxii. 1–36, when the pious man dies she appears to him as a beautiful and radiant maiden, descending from the heavenly places to conduct him through the stations of good thoughts, good words, and good deeds to the realms of light. When the pious man then beholds her he asks her who she is. "I am thy daēna, O youth, thou that thinkest good, speakest and doest, and art of good belief." She reveals to him that it is his earthly piety that has made her beautiful. In Manichæism, which represents the last stage of Iranian religion in the third and fourth centuries A.D., we have also an account of this "virgin who is like to the soul of this perfect(ed) one," appearing to the perfect one after his death, to save him and guide his soul to heaven.[1] She is the παρθένος τοῦ φωτός, whom Augustine (*contra Faustum*, xx. 6) mentions as the male-female being, Wisdom, of

---

[1] Cf. Report of the Fihrist on Mani's teaching (Reitzenstein, *I.E.R.*, p. 28). The virgin has the same character as the "Light god in the form of the leading Wise one." "Beide sind ursprünglich identisch" (Gressmann, *ut sup.*, p. 158).

Manichæan doctrine. We also learn of her that she is possessed of changing form and aspect (Le Coq, "Türkische Manichaica aus Chotscho," i. S. 25, *Abh. d. Berl. Akad.*, 1912).[1] In Mandæism, in which the same stream of Iranian thought runs, this virgin, who is like the soul of the perfect one, does not appear, but her place is taken by Manda d'Haije, that is, by *γνῶσις ζωῆς* or *γνῶσις θεοῦ*, who is called the image or reflection of the soul.[2] Thus it would appear that the daēna, the personified Religion, the virgin of light, Wisdom as man's better self or supernatural double, was a fruitful concept of Iranian belief, and that from this we can explain the mysterious appearance of the figure of Wisdom in Judaism and various features of the teaching regarding her.

The importance of the idea of Wisdom as a virgin of light is evident when we reflect that her being identified with the Law must have been a generally accepted thought even before the time of Sirach (cf. Charles, *Apoc.* i.—Sirach xv. 1). In Sirach she is Religion or Fear of the Lord (i. 10 f., etc.). She is described as a glorious woman to be sought and loved, as dwelling eternally with God, as enthroned "in the pillar of cloud" (xxiv. 4), and as "enlightening" (if the reading be תאיר; cf. Charles, *Apoc.* to iv. 11) all who give heed to her, but there is no description of her in terms of light such as we have in Sap. Sol. (vii. 26 f.). The reason for this must in part be, that the doctrine of a future life is absent in Sirach, and where " life " had not yet secured that full significance it had in Iranian religion, neither could its companion term " light." But the union of Wisdom with the Law (in Sirach xxiv. 23, even with the Book of the Covenant of God) does seem to have been the origin of a mystical application of the concept of light to the Law. In Ps. cxix., says Briggs (*Psalms*, vol. ii. p. 417), the Law has become to the author " the representative of his God. Throughout the psalm he ascribes to the Law the attributes older writers ascribe to God; looks to the Law for help and salvation that ordinarily come from God alone. The Law is to him almost hypostatical, almost what the Memra became to later Judaism. It was eternal in heaven before it came to the earth: it came to the earth and to man to remain everlastingly. Upon its observance depend life, salvation, knowledge, wisdom, happiness, and every joy." The psalm is generally acknowledged to be of late date, and Briggs takes the references to persecution because of the Law, to relate to the oppression of Israel by the Hellenistic party towards the close of the Greek period. In this psalm, where the ideas in respect of the Law are far in advance of Deuteronomy and the Priestly Code, and where the Torah is now to be " loved " (ver. 113) and is righteous and perfect as God Himself (see Cheyne, *Psalms*, 2nd ed. vol. ii. p. 168), the representation of the Law as light-endowed and light-bringing is also bold. " The opening of Thy word giveth light " (ver. 130). " Thy face make shine on Thy servant and Thy statutes teach (me) " (ver. 135). Here, Briggs (*ibid.*, p. 433) remarks, the thought is, " The Law, like Yahweh's face, gives light." That the Law was eternal in heaven prevents us from altogether rationalizing these expressions.

---

[1] Cf. Reitzenstein, *I.E.R.*, pp. 173, 174, 178. With this conception, *πολύμορφος παρθένος*, R. compares Sap. Sol. vii. 22: "For there is in her [Wisdom] a spirit quick of understanding (*πνεῦμα νοερόν*), holy, alone in kind (*μονογενές*), manifold (*πολυμερές*), subtil, freely moving, etc." In vers. 22, 23, Wisdom has twenty-one qualities. Cf. Charles, *Apoc.*, vol. i. *ad loc.* Cf. Sirach, iv. 17: "I will walk with him in disguise, etc."

[2] Reitzenstein, *ibid.*, p. 33 f: "Alle manichäischen Grundvorstellungen kehren in der mandäischen Religion wieder. Die Jungfrau, welche der Seele des Wahrhaftigen ähnlich ist, fehlt freilich. Ein männliches Gottwesen (Manda d'Haije also *γνῶσις ζωῆς* bzw. *γνῶσις θεοῦ* . . .) führt das Geleit. Aber er selbst bezeichnet sich als das Abbild der Seele oder wird von ihr so bezeichnet."

Indication of this mystic thought in regard to the Law may appear in the uniting of the hymn of the Heavens and the sun (Ps. xix. 2–7) to the praise of the Law (Ps. xix. 8–15). Ps. xix. 8–15 is of the same period as Ps. 119, and appears to reflect the same struggle in behalf of the Law against the oppressor. Its being joined to Ps. xix. 2–7, verses that are of antique beauty and belong to the best period of Hebrew poesy (Gunkel, *Ausgewählte Psalmen*, p. 28), Staerk would explain as an accident.[1] But rather the link of connexion binding the Law-hymn to the Sun-hymn is to be found in the content of thought (cf. v. 8). The Babylonian sun-hymns praise Shamash as the God of righteousness. His light is a symbol of justice. "Judge of heaven and earth," is his title in both hymns and historical texts—"perhaps the most frequent epithet by which he is addressed" (Jastrow, "Rel. of Babylonia," *H.B.D.* extra vol. p. 543). Also as heavenly judge he has as his attendants Righteousness and Truth.[2] But in Test. Levi xiv., a passage which Eduard Meyer holds to be an interpolation in Test. XII. and to refer to the licentious behaviour of the priesthood

---

[1] Staerk, *Lyrik*, "Schr. d. A.T., usw.," pp. 71, 72—Ps. xix. 1–7: "Es ist daher eine schwer begreifliche Verirrung, wenn gelehrte Erklärer der Psalmen die Einheit von Ps. xix. 2–7 und xix. 8–15, zu verteidigen gesucht haben. Das ist fast eine Beleidigung des dichterischen Genius, der uns den herrlichen Sonnenhymnus gedichtet hat. Wenn nicht—was doch das Wahrscheinlichste ist—die Verschmelzung des Hymnus und des Gebetes zu einer literarischen Einheit rein zufällig ist, so beweisst sie nur, dass den späteren Geschlechtern, die die Psalmen gesammelt und überliefert haben, jegliches Stilgefühl abging." "But more probable than any absence of 'Stilgefühl' causing the combination is that this is due to theological ideas."

[2] Cf. *Altorientalische Texte und Bilder* (Ungnad, Ranke, und Gressmann), pp. 82, 83 note d. 4. Staerk, *Lyrik*, p. xxiv: "Hymnus an den Sonnengott Shamash."

(ver. 5 f.) in the time of Jason and Menelaos,[1] we have a much clearer expression of this doctrinaire teaching concerning the Law. There, ver. 4, Levi asks, "But if ye be darkened through transgressions, what therefore will all the Gentiles do living in blindness? Yea, ye shall bring a curse upon your race, because the light of the Law, which was given (for) to lighten every man, this ye desire to destroy by teaching commandments contrary to the ordinances of God." Though this be an interpolation in a book where "it is quite clear that inspiration has come from the religion of Iran" (Bousset, *R. d. J.*, p. 515), and where also *σοφία* (Lev. xiii.; cf. Schürer, Bd. iii. p. 249) is identified with the Law, the thought that the light of the Law is to lighten every man (cf. St. John i. 9) would as clearly seem to have its origin in Iranian belief, in which light is the divine part of our souls (Reitzenstein, *Hellenist. Myst. Religionen*, p. 364). The thought of Test. Levi xiv. connects with the description of Wisdom in Sirach. In Sirach, Wisdom has a wider and a narrower application. In the first she is poured over all God's works, and all flesh has something of her (i. 9 f.); in the narrower aspect she attaches herself to the pious (the *πιστοί*=הנאמנים) in the mother's womb (i. 14).[2] To the mind of Sirach, for whom Wisdom is the Law, these *πιστοί* are, *a parte potiori*, the Jews.[3]

---

[1] Meyer, *Ursprung und Anfänge, usw.*, Bd. ii. S. 168; cf. note 3 for Meyer's criticism of Bousset's date of interpolated passages in Test. Levi. Meyer places Test. XII.: "etwa am Ende des 3. Jahrhunderts," B.C. See pp. 12, 44. Cf. Schürer, *Gesch.*, iii. p. 349, who thinks the passage suits the pre-Maccabean time, but, as Meyer remarks, "does not draw the consequences." Cf. Bousset, *R. d. J.*, p. 14 f. Charles (*Apoc., ad loc.*) sees a reference to Jannæus (78 B.C.) in the charges of gross immorality, but, as Meyer observes, "Sünder gab es zu allen Zeiten."

[2] Sirach i. 14: *καὶ μετὰ πιστῶν ἐν μήτρᾳ συνεκτίσθη αὐτοῖς.* Kautzsch, *Apok.*, Bd. i. p. 262. נאמנים "die sich (als treu) bewährt haben."

[3] Cf. Bertholet, *Bib. Theol. d. A.T.*, p. 176 f.

The light-concept which in his description of Wisdom we saw was not developed, is supplied by Levi xiv. From the two passages we can gather that in the particularistic Jewish adaptation of Iranian beliefs Wisdom-Law had become the light that lightens every man (son of Israel) that comes into the world. Her nature fully accords with that of the daēna or *παρθένος τοῦ φωτός* of the soul. Her prototype is the radiant maiden who, as the soul's image, receives the soul of the pious one in the revelation of Ahuramazda to Zoroaster (Yasht xxii.), and who became the male-female being or "virgin like unto the soul of the perfect one" of Manichæan teaching. She is joined with the soul from the beginning as angel.

How powerful these conceptions were which account for the appearance of Wisdom in Judaism is seen at a further stage in Gnostic thought. Reitzenstein[1] points out that the movement which is called Gnosticism was not, strictly speaking, a religion, that its history does not belong simply to Church-history, but to the general history of religion; that it is a syncretism of thought representing the development of the individualistic and universalistic teaching of the Oriental religions, and in a certain sense is the last stage of Hellenism. Though the term *γνῶσις* has Hellenic stamp, the most important elements of the "Gnostic" movement which interpenetrated the Egyptian, Phrygian, Jewish, and Christian religions came from Iran. According to Reitzenstein (and Gressmann, *Z.K.G.*, p. 174) the Wisdom of the Jewish Wisdom-literature and the Christian Gnosis are one and the same form of deified Wisdom. But Gnosticism in its main features is prior to St. Paul, who encounters the word γνῶσις already endowed with technical significance.[1] No symbol of it is so frequent in the Hermetic writings as that of light (τὸ τῆς γνώσεως φῶς), where φωτίζειν is applied to it just as applied to it by St. Paul (2 Cor. iv. 6).[2] For St. Paul this φωτισμὸν τῆς γνώσεως τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ is the Christian revelation.[3] That is, as in Judaism the nature of Wisdom-daēna is given to the Law, so in the Christian teaching of St. Paul γνῶσις is interpreted of the revelation in Christ as contrasted with the Law. Here the Apostle follows an example which Jewish history had already given.

---

[1] *Die Hellenist. Myst. Religionen*, p. 69: "Der Gnosticismus." Cf. *Iran. Erlös. Myst.*, p. 146: "Es gibt im strengen Sinne keine gnostische Religion, nur verschiedene Grade eines Synkretismus dessen wichtigster Bestandteil iranisch ist."

In "Gnosticism" the word γνῶσις has full mystic significance. It is not merely an intellectual knowledge of God, but, as in the religious mysteries, it is the "seeing" of God who is light and makes into light, who is πνεῦμα and makes into πνεῦμα by giving ἀθανασία and γνῶσις. This seeing worked a change of nature, and what was effected was called γνῶσις. Even in St. Paul's writings this mystic element cannot be eliminated from his use of the term, nor from the great spiritual conceptions πνεῦμα and others which gathered round it in Hellenistic mysticism. Reitzenstein (*Die Hellenist. Myst. Rel.*, p. 299 f.) doubts very much whether St. Paul, who so often speaks of γνῶναι θεόν, ever conceived of this as "intellectual knowledge" (*verstandesmässige Erkenntnis*), or would even admit the possibility of such. In the Hermetic writings the kingdom of Gnosis is heaven, into which the "seeing" of God elevates man. As Gnosis cannot be explained by its theoretic elements, neither are its characteristics of φῶς, etc., to be explained as *pictures*, but from the conceptions that are found in the mysteries and came through the channels of Oriental thought.

---

[1] *Hellenist. Myst. Rel.*, p. 67: "Dass Paulus den technischen Gebrauch des Wortes γνῶσις im Hellenismus kennt und nachahmt sollte schon hiernach klar sein."

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 292 f. (γνῶσις and φῶς); p. 89 (γνῶσις and St. Paul). Cf. p. 74.

[3] Cf. *Schriften d. N.T.* (Göttingen)—2 Korintherbrief (Bousset)—2 Kor. iv. 1–6, p. 180: "Die Herrlichkeit Christi fasst Paulus in das Wort vom 'Ebenbild Gottes' zusammen. Der erhöhte Christus (nicht das Gesetz) ist ihm ein Abbild, eine Ausstrahlung Gottes."

When we compare the γνῶσις of "Gnosticism" with the concepts of Wisdom and Law as these appear in the Wisdom-literature and in Test. Levi xiv., we may detect in Jewish thought a phase of a development that reached fruition in other religions. But in all stages of this evolution of thought, from the daēna of the Persians to the Wisdom-Law of Judaism, or to the Gnosis of St. Paul's day and later, the element of mystic theological belief is present as the very essence. When Wisdom was identified with the Law, there attached to the latter what may be called a theology of light. The interpretation of the lamp of Hanukkah as the light of the Law is therefore based on a more substantial foundation than that of poetry or metaphor. When we speak of symbol, we must unite with this the theological conceptions of the age which constituted it as such. But whether the theory of Grätz is a full explanation of the significance of the light-symbol of Hanukkah, we may judge after viewing the festival of Hanukkah in what would seem to be, apart from the two rites it took over and transformed, its main character.

CHAPTER VII

THE FESTIVAL OF THE NEW AGE

CHAPTER VII

THE FESTIVAL OF THE NEW AGE

I

WHEN Wellhausen, Meyer, Gressmann, Norden, and Kittel, following Ewald, hold the Jewish "festival of lights" to be a transformation of a heathen winter-solstice festival,[1] they do so on account of two features—the date 25th Kislev and the lighting of lamps. Riehm had rejected this hypothesis because of the lack of historical evidence for a solstice festival upon which Hanukkah could be based,[2] but Norden and Kittel point, for a parallel to the type of festival underlying Hanukkah, to the celebrations which, according to Epiphanius (*Hær.* li. 22. 4 f.), were called by the Alexandrians Kikellia, by the Egyptians Kronia, and by the Romans Saturnalia. The date of the Kikellia as held at Alexandria, Epiphanius gives as eight days before the Calends of January, that is the 25th December.

---

[1] See Wellhausen, "Über den gesch. Wert des 2 M., usw.," *Nachr. d. Gött. Gesell. d. Wiss.*, 1905, p. 130 f. Cf. Gesch. 210, 2. Ed. Meyer, *Ursprung*, Bd. ii. p. 209, Anm. 5. Ed. Norden, *Die Geburt des Kindes, Gesch. einer religiösen Idee*, 1924, p. 24 f. R. Kittel, *Die hellenistische Mysterienrel. und das A.T.*, 1924, p. 20 f. H. Gressmann, *Die hellenistische Gestirnreligion*, 1925, p. 19. Cf. Dillmann, "Kirchweihfest" (*Schenkels Bibel-Lexikon*, Bd. iii.): "Dabei mochte es erwünscht scheinen, diesen Monat, wo die Heiden ihr Sonnenwendefest und ihre Dyonysien feierten, auch ein Fest, nur höherer Art, zu haben."

[2] Riehm, "Kirchweihfest" (*Handwörterbuch des bibl. Altertums*): "Denn von einer um diese Zeit gehaltenen derartigen Feier ist geschichtlich nichts bekannt: erst im Februar fand eine solche statt (an welche sich in der christlichen Kirche die Lichtmessfeier angeknüpft hat)."

The festival is mentioned by name (*Κικήλλια*) in the decree of Canopus (239–238 B.C.), and, in view of Epiphanius' statement regarding the date, would appear to be referred to by the Calendar of Antiochus (*circa* A.D. 200), which, opposite the date 25th December, has the ascription, "Birthday of the Sun: the light grows" (*Ἡλίου γενέθλιον αὔξει φῶς*). What the full significance of these words was has been justly illustrated from the account which Macrobius in the fifth century gives of an Egyptian winter-solstice custom. He reports that on the shortest day the image of a small boy was brought forth at daybreak from the adyton of a temple, as representative of the infant sun.[1] Combining, further, these references with a scholion to Gregory Nazianzus (fourth century), Norden gives the following description of the ceremony. In the night of 24th–25th December the worshippers assemble in a subterranean room. Here at midnight certain religious rites are performed—rites of initiation. Then at daybreak the Mystai issue from the adyton bearing the statuette of the boy, symbol of the new-born sun-god; and when the sun's light falls upon the congregation the cry is raised: "The virgin has begotten, the light grows" (*ἡ παρθένος τέτοκεν, αὔξει φῶς*).[2] Thus it would seem, although the testimony comes from the period of the Roman Empire, that the Kikellia as winter-solstice festival can be traced as far back as the third pre-Christian century, when its name is mentioned in the decree of Canopus.

Kittel (p. 22) estimates that it is in the highest degree probable that the Kikellia, like the Saturnalia and Kronia, which were festive rejoicings in the period when the sun's light waned before it again increased, was like the Jewish winter-festival, a "festival of lights." And Norden brings forward the fact that when the Church, between the years 354 and 360, chose the day of the winter-solstice, the ancient birthday of the sun-gods, on which to celebrate the birthday of Christ, the Church at Jerusalem resisted the innovation. To explain this, Usener, in his history of the festival of Christmas, could find no satisfactory reason. But Norden suggests that the resistance on the part of the Christians at Jerusalem may have been due to the 25th of December having been for many centuries (*seit vielen Jahrhunderten*) the date of Hanukkah, and that the Christians were shy of placing *their* Light-festival on the same day as the Jewish (*G. d. K.*, p. 27, note 1).

---

[1] Macrobius, *Sat.* i. 18. 10: "hae autem (aetatum, ed. Eyssenhardt, 1893) diversitates ad Solem referentur, ut parvulus videatur hiemali solstitio, quem Aegyptii proferunt ex adyto die certa, quod tunc brevissimo die veluti parvus et infans videatur."

[2] Schol. to Greg. Naz. (Holl, *Untersuchung über d. Ursprung d. Epiphanienfestes*, p. 427; *Sitz. Ber. d. Berl. Akad.*, 1917, S. 402 f.; Norden, *G. d. Kindes*, p. 25; Kittel, *Die hellen. Mysterienrel.*, p. 23), where the reference is to the birthday of Christ.

The case for the festival underlying Hanukkah being a winter-solstice festival would have the weight of much probability if it could be shown (cf. Chap. IV.) that Hanukkah took place on the 25th of December, or that 25th Kislev generally was the 25th of December, and a certain degree of probability if it could be accepted that the solstice fell within the eight days of the feast. But even the Kikellia (which it may be supposed from Epiphanius' comparison of it with the Kronia and Saturnalia, bore features of sun-worship) cannot be stated, on account of the date found attached to it in the Roman period, and of the late report by Macrobius of an Egyptian shortest-day festival, to have been a winter-solstice festival originally, or to have had that character in the second century B.C. The links combined by Norden and Kittel into a chain of evidence for the Kikellia being a winter-solstice festival seem to fit well together, but do not bear the test to which Nilsson (*Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, 5th June 1926, Heft 23) subjects these writers' conclusions. The earliest record, the decree of Canopus, does not mention the Kikellia as being on the day of the solstice, but witnesses that in the ninth year of Ptolemy III. the Kikellia were held in the month of Choiak, before the ship-procession in honour of Osiris, which took place on the 29th of Choiak. It is certain, Nilsson says, that the intercalation, for the purpose of rectifying the calendar, and ordered in this decree, soon fell out of service, and that the Egyptian variable year then took its normal course again. The date of the Kikellia, upon this, receded, and fell in 26–25 B.C., when Augustus probably introduced the Egyptian fixed year, on the 25th of December, and the festival remained thereafter at this date, where Epiphanius found it. The celebrations, of whatever nature they may have been, were bound to the old variable year, and that they occurred at the winter-solstice after 26 B.C. was due to the incidence of fixing the Egyptian year at this time. The exact date of the Kikellia is therefore not known. It fell before a certain act which was performed on the 29th Choiak in the Osiris festival. In the Ramesid period the Osiris festival lasted for some days, from the 20th to the 30th Choiak. The Kikellia therefore, Nilsson holds, we are only entitled to regard as the name of a festival, popular in Alexandria, which preceded as a preliminary celebration the several days of the Osiris festival.[1]

The terms Kronia and Saturnalia which Epiphanius applies to the Kikellia—a word of unknown meaning—are of the nature of translations, whether by himself or others. The fact that the Saturnalia, reckoned by Epiphanius among festivals of the 25th December (cf. Nilsson, *ibid.*; Holl, "*Untersuchung, usw.*," *ut sup.*, p. 284), were celebrated on the 17th of December and never covered the 25th of the month, is proof that he did not concern himself with an accurate account of days. But that even after the reform of the calendar, which, as Nilsson emphasizes, gave a tremendous impulse to the Sun-religion by providing it with fixed dates,[1] the Saturnalia, though their dating was adjusted,[2] were not placed on the 25th of December, shows that in the consciousness of the people they were not thought of as having the character of a winter-solstice festival. Therefore, separated from the day of the winter-solstice, and consequently from the proceeding described by Macrobius, dissociated from the scholion to Gregory Nazianzus, and from the ascription to 25th December contained in the calendar of Antiochus, the Kikellia cannot provide a parallel or pattern as solstice festival for the Jewish festival of Lights. The age of the Kikellia and the analogy with the Kronia and Saturnalia appear alone as the reliable data concerning the Alexandrian festival.

---

[1] Nilsson, *loc. cit.*: "Der Name eines Vorfestes der mehrtägigen Osirisfeier, das dort besonders populär war." Plutarch (*De Is. et Os.* 52) reports that a ceremony of the Osiris festival, "The Seeking of Osiris," was held at the winter-solstice.

---

[1] Nilsson, *loc. cit.*: "Die älteren Kalender nahmen auf die bedeutsamen Punkte keine Rücksicht; die konnten nur mit Hilfe astronomischer Beobachtung oder Verwandlungstabellen, der Parapegmen, ausfindig gemacht werden. Erst durch einen an die Sonne gebundenen Kalender kamen die Tage in den allgemeinen geistigen Besitz. Die Sonnenreligion als allgemeine, dem Volk verständliche Religionsform ist ohne ein Kalendarisches Sonnenjahr . . . nicht denkbar."

[2] Their dating was adjusted, not the date. Cf. *Roschers Lexikon der griech. und röm. Myth.*, col. 436–437: "Das Fest der Saturnalia . . . hat zu allen Zeiten am 17. Dezember stattgefunden, an dem es die Kalender verzeichnen. . . . Caesars Kalenderreform führte nur eine andere Bezeichnung (XVI. Kal. Jan. anstatt bisher XIIII. Kal. Jan.) nicht eine Verlegung des Tages herbei, wie manche fälschlich annahmen. . . . Dieser Tag ist auch der einzige offizielle Festtag geblieben."

Mindful that, as Nilsson warns, only general comparisons can be drawn between a day in the Jewish luni-solar empiric calendar and a fixed date in the Julian, we can now ask to what date in the Julian calendar the 25th of Kislev corresponds. Sanhedrin Yer. 18d acquaints us with the three kinds of considerations which the Jewish calendar had to satisfy. These relate to the spring-crop, the fruit trees, and the equinox. The barley must be in ear at Passover (Ex. ix. 31, xxiii. 15; Deut. xvi. 7); the tekuphah, the equinox, had reference to Booths (Ex. xxiii. 16); and the fruit trees were to be in fruit at Weeks, from which term the first-fruits were brought to the temple (Ex. xxiii. 16). It may be gathered from this that the Rabbinic sources, though belonging to the days of the calculated calendar which was accepted generally about the second century A.D. and adopted in the fourth century A.D., conservatively reflect the consistent Jewish tradition and its empiric method.[1] They indicate that the winter-solstice fell in the month of Tebeth. It is the "tekuphath Tebeth" (cf. Jastrow, *Talmud Dict.*, "Tekuphah"). That midwinter was posterior to the 8th of this month might be inferred from the statement in the appendix to Meg. Taʿan.: "On the eighth of Tebeth the law was written in Greek in the days of King Tolmai, and darkness fell upon the world for three days."[2] The Septuagint translation, celebrated in Alexandria once by a festival, was, on account of the inconvenient, or erroneous, application by the Christians of the LXX renderings, memorialized later in Palestine by a fast. The suitability of the date of this in Tebeth, is by some subtlety of irony driven home by the thought that the darkest days of winter then began to possess the world. Lightfoot (*Horæ Heb.* to St. John x. 22), who held that the eight days of Hanukkah, commencing on the 25th of Kislev coincided with the winter-solstice, confesses himself thereupon to be at a loss to account for the reading of the Targum explanatory of the passage (1 Chron. xi. 22) reporting Benaiah's brave deed in slaying a lion on a snowy day: יומא זוטה דסיתווה בעשרא יומין בירחא דטבת. Lightfoot hesitates whether he should render the meaning as "the shortest day" of winter or "a short day, *i.e.* one of the short days of winter, namely, the tenth of the month of Tebeth." Then he makes the cryptic conjecture that the writer may have reckoned according to "our calendar" rather than the Jewish. But it seems apparent that the Targum desires to place Benaiah's heroic adventure in the very midst of winter, and has no other than the traditional Jewish conceptions of when that was, in view. Even in the days of the calculated Jewish calendar, when, sometimes consequent on intercalation, the tekuphoth (Tishri, Tebeth, Nisan, Tammuz) moved from their months, they were still called by the names of the months to which they, as a rule, belonged (Ideler, Bd. i. p. 551). This must have been due to anciently established association of the tekuphoth with these months.

---

[1] Cf. Abrahams, art. "Time," in *H.B.D.*, p. 764; Dalman, *R.E. für prot. Theol. und Kirche* (Herzog-Hauck), Synagogaler Gottesdienst (Der Kalender); Schürer, Bd. i. 4th ed. p. 753, Anm. 19 (*re* Bab. Shn. 11a, 12a); Ideler, *Handbuch d. math. und techn. Chronologie*, Bd. i., *re* Talmud and the regulation of the calendar, pp. 575–576.

[2] Meg. Taʿan. appendix: בשמונה בטבת נכבתה התורה יונים בימי תלמי המלך והחשך בא לעולם שלשה ימים:

We have already referred (Chapter IV.) to the impossibility of equating the 25th December with the 25th of Kislev, and to what would seem the difficult, if not hopeless, task which Nilsson sets those who believe Hanukkah was a winter-solstice festival, namely, to show that Hanukkah had been originally a winter-solstice celebration, and for some reason was afterwards placed on the 25th of Kislev. With this supposition of the date of the festival being altered, it is of interest to compare an advance which has been made on Krauss's theory that lamps were introduced at Hanukkah in the days of Herod. Saintyves, who gives a full account of the rite of the renewing of the sacred fire among various peoples at their sun-festivals, and sees herein the origin of the Hanukkah-lamp, thinks that probably this rite was practised in the spring by the Israelites prior to Herod, and that Herod transferred the custom to the winter season.[1] The plan of transferring a festival to another date or of transferring spring customs to the winter, is not one that appears probable. But from the divergence of Daniel's account of the time when the temple was desecrated (Dan. xii. 11—summer ; cf. Meyer, *Ursprung*, Bd. ii. p. 159), from the statements of 1 M. iv. 52 f., 2 M. x. 5, which display their authors' interest in bringing the date of the desecration into agreement with that of the reinstitution, we may judge that the secure element is the date 25th Kislev for the day of the festival that underlies Hanukkah.

In seeking to place 25th Kislev in the solar calendar, we can base on those popular conceptions which were the guide of the ordinary person dependent upon a luni-solar calendar, and which must have provided general guidance to those who from time to time ordered such a calendar. Important indication is given of the ideas which ruled in regard to the seasons, their beginnings and their extent. Baba Mezia 106b, in its division of the year into six parts, records that "half of Tishri, the whole of Marsheshvan, and half of Kislev is seedtime (זרע); half of Kislev, the whole of Tebeth, and half of Shebat is winter (חורף); half of Shebat, the whole of Adar, and half of Nisan is the cool season (קור); half of Nisan, the whole of Ijjar, and half of Sivan is harvest (קציר); half of Sivan, the whole of Tammuz, and half of Ab is summer (קייץ); half of Ab, the whole of Elul, and half of Tishri is the hot season (חום)." In this scheme which the empiric intercalations must be regarded as intended to stabilize, we observe that the beginning of winter was the 15th (or 16th) of Kislev, and that midwinter fell in Tebeth.[1] The festival of Hanukkah was therefore ten days after the beginning of winter. If the 15th of Kislev, the start of winter, were represented, as Lightfoot (*Horæ Heb.* to St. John iv. 35) supposes, by the beginning of December, Hanukkah would have fallen about the 10th of December, and its eight days would not cover the solstice period, though Lightfoot later (to St. John x. 22) assumes that they did. All therefore depends on what we must understand by the "beginning of winter," on the possibility of defining by some more or less fixed date what this term implies. Now in a calendar to which Fr. Boll refers,[2] and which Norden (*Geburt des Kindes*, p. 36) specifies as being of very good tradition, midwinter (*μέσος χειμών*) is the 6th of January. This means that the beginning of winter is the 8th of November. "The 8th of November," Boll observes, "is the date of the early setting of the

---

[1] Saintyves, *Essais de Folklore Biblique*, pp. 42–43 : " Et nous voici ramenés par un détour inattendu à Jerusalem à la pâque juive au renouvellement miraculeux du feu tel que nous l'avons vu pratiquer chez les Israélites et tel probablement qu'il se pratiquait à la même époque avant Hérode qui semble avoir fait transporter en hiver la fête de la dédicace " (!)

---

[1] Cf. Lightfoot, *Horæ Heb.* to St. John x. 22. Strack und Billerbeck (Bd. ii. p. 541) practically equate Kislev and December: "Der halbe Kislev, der Tebeth und der halbe Shebat (also etwa 15. Dec. bis 15. Febr.) ist Winter." If 25th Kislev = *circa* 25th December, the middle month of winter could not all be Tebeth..

[2] Fr. Boll, *Arch. f. Rel. Wiss.*, xix. (1918), p. 190: "μέσος χειμὼν nach Euktemon bei Ps. Geminos in Lydus *de ost.*" (ed. Wachsmuth, 2nd ed. p. 189, 18).

Pleiades and therewith, according to a widely spread and popular calendar, the beginning of the winter, and at the same time the beginning of the year."[1] When Josephus (*Ant.* xiii. 8. 2; cf. Schürer, *Gesch.*, 4th ed. Bd. i. p. 259, Anm. 5; Taylor, *H.B.D.*, "Pleiades"), in his almost solitary reference to astronomical phenomena, informs his readers that the water-famine in Jerusalem, when the city was besieged by Antiochus vii. Sidetes in the time of Hyrkanus, was fortunately brought to an end by the rainfall at the setting of the Pleiades (δυομένης Πλειάδος), we must regard his seasonal date as intending what the reference in Baba Mezia intends when it places the beginning of winter in the centre of Kislev. The setting of the Pleiades was to the ancients the end of the season of navigation. Winter had then set in (cf. St. John x. 22). When we compare the language of St. John, "It was then the enkainia in Jerusalem; it was winter (χειμὼν ἦν)," with the indication in Baba Mezia 106b regarding the seasons, it can be inferred that St. John, who especially is master of the art of employing the external and natural phenomena to deepen the spiritual, did not mean midwinter (μέσος χειμών).

To this date (November 8th) for the beginning of winter we must relate another. The 18th of November was the New Year's Day in the province of Syria, where sun-worship was rooted, and was the festival day of the Sun-God, who was Year-Lord (Weber, *Arch. für Rel. Wiss.*, xix. 1916–19, p. 315 f., "Das Kronosfest in Durostorum").[2] That these two seasonal terms, the 8th November and the 18th November, were of outstanding importance may be seen from their being brought into relation with events in the life of Christ. In Cyprus the 8th of November was the date of the baptism of Jesus,[1] and to Clement of Alexandria the 18th of November was his birthday.[2] In the Egyptian calendar in Clement's time, the 25th December was the birthday of the Sun-God. But Clement's date for the birth of Christ, Weber thinks, did not rest upon any feature of the Egyptian calendar, but was inspired by opposition to the Syrian Sun-religion. Though in Syria and in the eastern portion of the Roman Empire, as is shown by an inscription containing an order of Licinius to the troops in Salsovia *Mœsiæ inferioris*, the 18th of November was retained as the Sun-festival,[3] the Church discovered that the 25th of December had become more popularly and generally held as the Sun-day, and therefore the more needful of conversion to Christmas. In the endeavour of Clement in behalf of the 18th November, and in the fact that in the days of Licinius in the Syrian sphere of the Empire the 18th November was the festival of *dei sancti solis*, Weber perceives a token of the prominent place which Syrian religion had secured in the general civilization of the period, and concludes that when Aurelian brought the Syrian Sun-cult to Rome and made the festival of the God the 25th December, in this point he departed from the custom of the home-land of the cult (" So ist er in diesem Punkt von dem Brauch der Heimat der Religion abgewichen ").[1]

---

[1] Fr. Boll, *Arch. f. Rel. Wiss.*: "Der 8. November ist der Frühuntergang der Pleiaden und damit nach wietverbreitetem populären Kalender der Winteranfang und damit zugleich der Anfang des Jahres."

[2] Weber, *ut sup.*: "Der Festtag des Sonnengottes am 18. Nov. ist der Neujahrstag der Provinz Syrien, in der die Sonnenreligion heimisch ist, in vorkonstantinischer Zeit gewesen; der Gott war damit Herrscher über das Jahr."

---

[1] K. Holl, *Untersuchung*, *usw.*, p. 24, l. 407 f.; Norden, *ut sup.* p. 36; Ideler, *Handbuch*, vol. i. p. 420, ref. to Epiphanius (*Hær.* 51. 24), who places Jesus' baptism on 16th Apellæus of the Macedonians, *i.e.* on 8th November.

[2] Weber, *ut sup.*, p. 325 f.

[3] Weber, *ut sup.*, p. 324. Inscription published by Domaszewski: "Dei sancti solis simulacrum conseer(atum) die XIIII. Kal. Decemb. Debet singulis annis jusso sacro d(ominorum) n(ostrorum) Licini Aug(usti)et Licinii Caes(aris)ture, cereis et profusionibus eodem die a praep(ositis) et vexillat(ionibus) in cast(ris) Salsoviensib(us) agentibus exorari. Val. Romulus v(ir) p(erfectissimus) dux secutus jussionem describsit."

Comparing the statement of Baba Mezia with these data brought by Boll and Weber, we are justified in placing the festival of Hanukkah and the festival which under Syrian rule was the forerunner of Hanukkah, ten days after the beginning of winter, that is, on the 18th of November. This would require Kislev to include the last six days of October, and to be a month corresponding to October–November, a calculation which coincides with the views of Lund, Grätz, Derenbourg, and Venetianer, as to the calendaric character of this month.[2] Also a light may be shed by this conclusion on the two dates, 15th Kislev (desecration of the temple by the heathen, 1 M. i. 54) and 25th Kislev (reinstitution of the cultus, 1 M. iv. 52 f.), which 1 M. offers. Wellhausen (*Nachr.*, p. 130 f.) and Meyer (*Ursprung*, Bd. ii. p. 159, note 3) are not satisfied that the first date is a mere textual error for the 25th Kislev. If their judgment is right, the two dates may be explained by the 8th November and the 18th November being both important dates, and both variously regarded as the beginning of the New Year (cf. Boll, *ut sup.*) by heathen communities. The sources of 1 M. probably recorded religious rites of the heathen on both days. But a result that is most significant emerges from these inferences. That relationship between Hanukkah and Booths which the statements of 2 M. x. 6 f. are so inadequate to establish, yet which nevertheless persists in the name " Booths of Kislev," can now be done full justice. Booths was a New-Year festival, held, as the phrase בצאת השנה (Ex. xxiii. 16) must be interpreted as meaning, " at the going forth of the year," that is, at the year's beginning[1] (cf. G. Buchanan Gray, *Sacrifice in O.T.*, p. 300 f.). To Hanukkah, which supplanted the Syrian New-Year festival, indeed to the Syrian festival itself before it was reformed, could therefore most appropriately be given the title " Booths of Kislev," quite apart from any similarity the two New-Year celebrations of Tishri and Kislev possessed in respect of the rite of bearing branches. Thus truly the festival of Kislev is a "Second Booths," and it must seem that between the two celebrations their New-Year character is the real connecting link, in place of which the festival-exposition of 2 M. forges others (compensation for Booths; bearing of branches as at Booths), which should not bear the mark and seal of Hanukkah's heathen progenitor.

---

[1] It lies at hand to suppose that the resistance of the Church at Jerusalem to the acceptance of 25th December as birthday of Christ was due to a preference for the old Syrian Sun-day, the 18th of November.

[2] Cf. Lund (Mish. Surenh. to Taʿan. ii. 10): " vespera praecedente diem XXV. Cislev (qui respondet Novembri)," etc. Grätz, *History of the Jews*, vol. i. p. 488 *et al.*; Derenbourg, *Essai*, p. 41, Kislev = Oct.–Nov.; L. Venetianer, " Ursprung und Bedeutung d. Propheten-Lektionen," in *Z.D.M.G.* Bd. lxiii., Leip., 1909, p. 145. The Roman breviary in its lections commemorates the Maccabees and the events of Hanukkah in October (Venetianer, p. 145). Cf. Eadie, *Eccl. Ency.*, art. " Dedication of Churches." In 1536 church-wakes (*Kirchweiches*) ordered to be celebrated on first Sunday in October, to avoid multiplicity of such holidays. Though Josephus (*Ant.* xii. 7. 6) may be only comparing a Hebrew lunar month with a Macedonian lunar month (so Ideler, *Handbuch*, p. 401, Bd. i., as against Scaliger and Usher) when he reports that the Jewish festival of lights is on the 25th of the Macedonian month Apellaios, it is to be noted that the month Apellaios, employed differently in the numerous cities of the Greek East in representing the Julian Sun-year, began in the " Ephesian " calendar on 24th October (cf. Kubitschek, art. Ἀπελλαῖος in *P.-W.*). The 25th of Apellaios would there be the 17th of November. The names of the months of this calendar are the Macedonian (" durchaus die macedonischen," Ideler, p. 420), and Ideler says this without doubt is the one to which Galenus (*circa* A.D. 150) refers when he mentions that, besides the Romans, the Macedonians had a Sun-calendar. " Er (der ephesische Kalender) muss aber in Kleinasien sehr verbreitet gewesen sein; denn wir finden in den ersten Jahrhunderten der Christenheit nicht selten nach ihm datiert " (p. 420; cf. also p. 425).

---

[1] Midrash Bereshith Rabba, Par. xxii. chap. iv. ver. 3, preserves a tradition that Abel lived from New Year to Hanukkah, and that his life-span was no longer than fifty days. There is reason to believe that Booths as New-Year festival is intended, not only because the text contrasts the period between Passover and Pentecost, but because between New Year (Tishri 1–2) and 25th Kislev there are more than eighty days. In the lunar calendar there are at least sixty days between the last day (23rd Tishri) of Booths and 25th Kislev. But between a Booths which holds to the empiric determinant, the equinox (cf. p. 196) 23rd September, and lasts to 1st October, and Hanukkah (18th–25th November), the span of fifty days is an efficient bridge.

II

We must now revert to Wellhausen's hypothesis as to the nature of the festival on the 25th Kislev which the Hanukkah festival was intended to render innocuous. The date which, he declared, nothing in the Jewish cultus could explain, and which he regarded as betokening a pagan festival held at the winter-solstice, is itself an insuperable difficulty in the path of this assumption. On the other hand, we have admitted his conclusion, founded on a comparison of the statements in 2 M. vi. 7 and 1 M. i. 58–59, that the heathen celebrations contained a Dionysian element. Norden (*G. d. K.*, p. 26, note 4), who challenges Wellhausen's textual combination, asserts that the Dionysian procession mentioned in 2 M. vi. 7 can have had no connexion with the sacrifice upon the altar, of which 1 M. i. 59 speaks, for the altar was erected to Olympian Zeus. But Wellhausen had answered this objection. The Dionysus in whose honour the procession on 25th Kislev was, would not, in the thought of the people of the time, be sharply distinguished from the Zeus of the new cult imposed upon the Jews (2 M. vi. 2). Both were called generally Bel-semin, the "Lord of the Heavens," and were the equivalent of the Jewish Jahveh or

"God of heaven."[1] However, it would seem to be more natural, though Dionysus was called ὕψιστος,[2] or "highest God," to make the distinction between the Dionysus, honoured by a procession on 25th Kislev, and the Zeus—the Baal Shamayim, the Shikkuz Shomem, the "abomination of desolation" of Dan. xii. 11—to whom sacrifice was made on the 25th Kislev. The date, the 25th Kislev, ten days after the beginning of winter, the commencement of the Syrian new year, points to the Supreme God of the pre-Hanukkah festival as having been honoured in the character of Sun-God.

The 18th of November, on which the troops in Salsovia, in accordance with the order of Licinius, celebrate the festival of the Sun-God, is the same date on which Boll (*Arch. f. Rel. Wiss.* xix. 1916–19, "Kronos-Helios," p. 342) and Weber (*ibid., ut sup.*, p. 315 f.) place the Kronos-festival mentioned in the Acta Dasii. The Acta narrate that in the camp of Durostorum (Silistria), at the annual Kronos festival in the reign of Diocletian, a Christian soldier, Dasius, was chosen to represent King Kronos. The festival lasted thirty days, and during this time it was the custom that the man chosen to play the part of King Kronos was arrayed in a kingly robe, and received the licence to taste of all life's pleasures, but at the end of the festival offered himself as a voluntary sacrifice to the God. Preferring rather to offer himself as a sacrifice to Christ, Dasius refuses to play the part chosen for him, enters in consequence into conflict with his companions, and suffers martyrdom, on 20th November, A.D. 303, that is, fifteen to seventeen years before the year of the above-given Licinian inscription. This festival of Kronos had evidently begun on the Sun-day, the 18th November, and would end on the Saturn's day of the Roman calendar, the 17th December. Weber remarks that the festival in Durostorum is not Roman, but Syrian in character, a celebration in honour of the Lord of the year by troops in the Oriental part of the Empire, and that the voluntary death or *λύτρον* is based upon Phœnician conceptions and rites.[1]

---

[1] Wellhausen, *Nachr.*, p. 131: "Ob der Dionysus, zu dessen Ehren die jerusalemische Feier eingerichtet wurde von dem Zeus Olympius (2 M. vi. 2) so sehr verschieden war, kann bezweifelt werden. Der 'Herr des Himmels' (Bel-semin) entspricht so wohl diesem als jenem, konnte andrerseits auch als Äquivalent des 'Gottes des Himmels,' gelten wie die Juden damals ihren alten Jahve nannten. Die einheimische Sprache wurde in Jerusalem nicht unterdrückt: man sagte dort weder Dionysus noch Zeus Olympius sondern vermutlich eben Bel-semin."

[2] *e.g.* inscription in Pirot in Serbia, cf. Schürer, *Über die Juden im bosp. Reiche, usw.*, p. 210 f. Cumont, ὕψιστος in *P.-W.-Kroll.* Cf. poem of Ausonius (*circa* A.D. 310) entitled "An Outlandish Medley (*Mixobarbaron*) to a Marble Statue of Liber Pater in my Country House, having the Attributes of all Gods" (*omnium Deorum argumenta habenti*), xlviii. p. 186 in vol. ii. *Ausonius*: Loeb Classical Library. Here Dionysus is called "Pantheum," the universal God; also cf. No. xlix.

In comparing the two festivals of the same date, the Licinian Helios-festival and that of Kronos in Durostorum, Weber (p. 340) had perceived a "connexion" (*Zusammenhang*) between the festivals and their gods. Boll makes clear (p. 240) that between the Syrian Kronos and the Sun-God we must not see merely a connexion, but that these Gods are actually identical. The Beiruth inscription, *Κρόνου Ἡλίου βωμός* (published 1872; cf. *Rev. Arch.*, 1903, i. p. 138), Cumont had regarded as resting upon a Greek misunderstanding and on confusion of the

---

[1] Weber, "Kronosfest in Durostorum," *Arch. f. Rel. Wiss.* xix. 1916–19, p. 399: "Die freiwillige Hingabe des dem König Kronos darstellenden Soldaten entspricht der in Phönikien gepflegten Anschauung und den Riten, wie sie von den sich gegen Menschenopfern wehrenden Kulturvölkern auch den Apologeten des Christentums immer wieder den Phönikiern und ihrer Dezendenz zugeschoben worden"; p. 340: "Sicher ist, dass im Jahr 303 das Fest der Saturnalien in Durostorum nicht nach römischen Bräuchen fragte, sondern von diesen ebensoweit entfernt ist wie Syrien von Rom." For sacrifice of Kronos' son invested with emblems of royalty, as propitiatory offering, see Euseb. *Præp. Ev.* i. 9. Cf. the fable in Jos. *Cont. Ap.* ii. 8, which bases upon pagan misrepresentation of Jahveh as Kronos.

Phœnician (Kronos)-El (Gr. ἦλος) with Helios. Also the observation of Servius (*Æn.* i. 642), " omnes in illis partibus Solem colunt, qui ipsorum lingua El dicitur " (cf. Serv. *Æn.* i. 729 : " apud Assyros autem Bel dicitur quadam sacrorum ratione et Saturnus et Sol "), was set down as an equating of Kronos and Helios which was based on a misconception due to similarity of sound. But now the identity of Kronos, the God of the planet Saturn, with the Sun-God has been generally recognized, and by the cuneiform inscriptions is well attested as a tenet of Babylonian astral religion.[1] It is presupposed by the designation of Saturn as Ra,[2] on an Egyptian ostracon of *circa* the first century A.D., and is witnessed as prevailing among the peoples of Central Asia (Ptolem. Tetrab. ii. 3, *σέβουσι τὸν μὲν τῆς Ἀφροδίτης (αστέρα) Ἶσιν ὀνομάζοντες, τὸν δὲ τοῦ Κρόνου Μίθραν Ἥλιον*). It finds its way into the Græco-Roman world.[3] " It is certain," Boll concludes, " that, for the Babylonians and Syrians, Kronos and Helios are one and the same divinity, who, in accordance with a common conception, was supposed to reveal himself in the two most powerful orbs of day and night." [4] Thus the connexion of the two gods which Weber supposed, Boll shows to be that of identity, and to be based on Babylonian astral teaching.

Fraught with special consequence for the character of the God Kronos-Helios, whose festival-day in Syria we see to be the 18th of November, was the uniting of Chaldean astral religion with speculations concerning the Aion or "Age," which attach to the Iranian doctrine of Zarvan akarana or "Endless-time." Iranian dualism, with its divisional principles of good and evil, darkness and light, had produced the natural desire for a monism from which to explain the totality of phenomena. The neutral and highest principle presiding over the two opposites, Ahuramazda and Ahriman, was found in Zarvan akarana. This doctrine can be traced to the Achæmenid period (Meyer, *Ursprung*, Bd. ii. p. 83 f.), as it is known to Eudemus of Rhodes, who reports that the Magians and the whole Arian race (*πᾶν τὸ Ἄρειον γένος*) called the first principle, some, "space" (*τόπος*), others, "time" (*χρόνος*), and that from this sprang a good god, Oromasdes, and an evil demon, Arimanios, or previous to these, as others say, light and darkness (Damascius, *de pr. princ.* 125). With this speculation there connected (cf. Meyer, *ibid.*, p. 85; Bousset, *Rel. d. Jud.*, p. 506 f.) the religious belief that the evil reign of Ahriman would eventually be brought to an end, that an age or new aion of bliss would dawn or be restored, that there are two world-ages—a present perishable age, and an age of freedom from all sufferings and cares. But it was upon the identification of Zarvan with Kronos-Helios that the ripe fruits of this religious thought depended. According to Reitzenstein this "equation of Zarvan (Bel) and Kronos in the whole area of Semitic speech finds early witness, and was everywhere spread abroad by the Stoic, indeed probably already by the Orphic and Sophist equation of *χρόνος* and Kronos."[1]

---

[1] Boll, *loc. cit.*, p. 343. Cf. Jensen (*Kosmologie der Bab.*, S. 115 f.); Jastrow (*Relig. Bab. und Assyr.* ii. 445, 483).

[2] Boll, *ibid.*, note 5.

[3] Macr. i. 22. 8 : " Saturnus ipse qui auctor est temporum et ideo a Graecis immutata littera Κρόνος quasi *χρόνος* vocatur, quid aliud nisi Sol intelligendus est ? "

[4] Boll, *loc. cit.*, p. 345 f. : " So viel ist aber sicher dass nach einer oft bezeugten Vorstellung der Babylonier und Syrer Kronos und Helios eine und dieselbe Gottheit sind, die sich in den zwei mächtigsten Gestirnen des Tages und der Nacht offenbarte."

---

[1] *I.E.M.*, p. 177, note 3: "Andrerseits ist die Gleichsetzung von Zarvan (Bel) und Kronos für das ganze semitische Sprachgebiet altbezeugt und durch die stoische ja wahrscheinlich schon orphische und sophistische Gleichsetzung von *χρόνος* und Kronos überallhin verbreitet." Cf. p. 188: "Wir sahen, dass an den iranischen Zeit-

Hellenic mythology, the picture Hesiod had made popular of the golden age when Kronos ruled, must have contributed to the strength of the union of the Iranian and Chaldean deities, and to the Iranian Aion-concept growing to be, as Norden says, "one of the central religious ideas of the Orient."[1] But when the identification of Zarvan, the Time- Eternity- and Light-God, with Kronos-Helios was made, the Chaldean theology, which regarded the portions of time, the years, days, hours, and the periods of world history as determined by the stars and the astral-deities, itself became the bearer of that Aion-mysticism (*Aionmystik.*, Norden, p. 29), or thought concerning the world-ages, which on Semitic, Hellenistic, and Roman soil was to bear rich result.

In the early Ptolemy period, the Aion-concept had established itself in Egypt. We may speak indeed now of an Aion-cult, for here, in Alexandria, Aion is personified, and for the first time appears as a God (*I.E.M.*, p. 188). Epiphanius (*Hær.* li. 22. 8 f.) describes the ritual of the festival of this god which took place on the night of 5th–6th January in the Koreion, the temple of Kore. After religious ceremonies, a wooden, naked image of a God, bound on brow, hands, and knees with golden cross-seals, is brought at daybreak from a subterranean adyton. A liturgical greeting explains the "mystery": "at this hour to-day the virgin has given birth to the Aion" (*ταύτῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ σήμερον ἡ κόρη ἐγέννησε τὸν Αἰῶνα*). The image was then carried on a bier seven times round the inner temple, after which

---

und Lichtgott schon im Orient theologische Spekulation sich schliessen musste, und dass er in Syrien in hellenistischer Zeit als Kronos-Helios gefasst wurde."

[1] Norden, *G. d. K.*, p. 29: "Immer weiter schweift der Blick, immer klarer stellt sich schon jetzt heraus, dass Aion eine der zentralen religiösen Ideen des Orients gewesen ist"; "Diese iranische-babylonische Aionmystik hat ihren Siegeszug über grosse Gebiete der Oikumene angetreten."

it was again deposited in the adyton. This festival Reitzenstein (*Nachr. Gött. Ges.*, 1904, p. 317 f.; cf. *I.E.M.*, p. 188 f.; Kittel, *Die hellen. Myst. Rel.*, p. 22) connects with the foundation of the city of Alexandria, Aion being a Greek interpretation of an Egyptian Earth- and Harvest-God, patron of the city. Whether, with Gressmann (*Tod und Auferstehung des Osiris*, p. 24), we see in the naked image the figure of a child or, with Norden (*G. d. K.*, p. 29; cf. *I.E.R.*, p. 196, note 2), of a man, the meaning of the ritual is clear. A new age or a new year, full of the promise of natural blessings of fruitfulness or national and political good, is symbolized as beginning. The old Aion is rung out, the new Aion rung in. Gressmann (*ibid.*, p. 24) also perceives in the festival a close association with that reported by Macrobius (*Sat.* i. 18. 9) as falling on the 25th December, and interprets the "parvulus" of the winter-solstice as Horus the Sun-God (*αὔξει φῶς*), while the Aion of 5th–6th January is either Horus simply, or is representative of Osiris returning from the realm of death to new life. If this be so, we have the same process as in Babylonia and Syria, the combination of the Aion-concept with the worship of the sun.

In Egypt, further, we have the Aion-concept uniting with the theological belief concerning Osiris and Isis (cf. Norden, *G. d. K.*, p. 30). Isis is described as "the Nature of the Aion; by whom all things arise and all things exist" (Athenag. *pro Christ.* 22, *περὶ τῆς Ἴσιδος ἣν φύσιν αἰῶνος, ἐξ ἧς πάντες ἔφυσαν καὶ δι᾿ ἧς πάντες εἰσίν, λέγουσιν*), "the primal begetter of the world-periods" ("sæculorum progenies initialis": Apuleius, M. xi. 5). As the idea penetrated to Greece through Eudoxus, Aristotle, Theopompus, so also it came to Rome about the time of Sulla and Cæsar, for the Consul M. Val.

Messala, *cos.* 53 B.C., identifies Aion with Janus (Lydus, *de Mens.* iv. 1, p. 64, Wünch; cf. Macr. *Sat.* i. 9. 14; cf. *I.E.M.*, p. 210 f.). Its great literary monument is the *Fourth Eclogue* (41 B.C.) of Vergil, who prophesies the birth of a child who was to bring a new age, a poem in which the most various notes of the Aion-belief are struck ("venit iam aetas; magnus saeclorum ordo; Saturnia regna; nova progenies cælo demittitur alto; gens aurea; regnat Apollo; magni menses; omnis feret omnia tellus").

In the apocryphal and pseudepigraphic writings of Judaism, and in the Book of Daniel, who begins a new period of eschatological writing, the Aion-concept quickens the older teachings concerning the future and becomes the connecting link of a catena of thought on world-periods, the present dominion of Satan over the world, the resurrection of the dead, world-destruction, and world-renewal. Of these theological ideas Bousset (*Rel. d. Jud.*, p. 209) observes that to suppose a parallel development of them in Judaism and in Iranian religion, where the former is independent of the latter, appears to be well-nigh excluded. But if the seed was carried to Jewish soil from Iran, it was brought to fruition by conditions internal to Judaism. The political outlook, the persecution of the faithful, the distress of the times, had produced an atmosphere in which speculation on world-epochs, new world-order, and world-end was the means of consolation as well as explanation of the world-drama. The Damascus text, the books of the Testaments, Enoch, and the Jubilees are conscious that the present age is the last time, the great tribulation before "the End," upon which follow the judgment and the new age. The Book of Daniel, on the very threshold of the Maccabean period, is the first to give a clearly drawn schematic picture of the eschatological events. Here the two great world-periods are sharply distinguished. The four world-kingdoms are succeeded by the kingdom of the saints, suddenly and without bridge between. Reitzenstein (*I.E.M.*, p. 232) regards this so clear division between the two aions in Daniel, with the emphasis on a world-renewal, as an advance upon Egyptian and even Iranian aion-conceptions, and as due to the political situation in which the book was composed. In 1 Enoch (xviii. 16, xxi. 6; cf. xvi. 1) the world-aion is reckoned as having a course of 10,000 years; in 2 Enoch, after 6000 years and a millennium of rest, the coming aion dawns, one and endless, in which the years and months and days and hours perish (xxxiii. 1, lxv. 7, 8). Men become inheritors of "endless time" (lxvi. 6; Charles, *Pseud.*). Speculation regarding the future aion, the thought that it will come after a certain number of men (2 Bar. xxiii. 4; cf. xxi. 10), or of righteous (1 Enoch xlvii. 4; 2 Bar. xxx. 2), have been born, that the time of its coming can be shortened by the prayer and cries of the righteous (Sir. xxxvi. 10; 1 Enoch xlvii. 1, xcix. 3), continues in Judaism, sometimes bursting out with greater force under national calamity and war with the Romans (cf. Bousset, *R. d. J.*, p. 428 f.; Bertholet, *Grundriss d. Theol. Wiss.*, p. 439), till in later times in Rabbinic circles, due to the tempering of judgment, the new aion, the coming of the future world, is made dependent on Israel's repentance and spiritual fitness.

In the picture of the new age as the Jewish apocalyptic writings present it to us, it is important for our subject to observe that while the description is not lacking in hopes of a highly spiritual and ethical kind (cf. 1 Enoch lxiv. 12, xci. 8, 11, 17), in the main it is of earthly prosperity, earthly abundance, and fruitfulness of the soil (Sib. iii. 783; 1 Enoch x. 18 f.; cf. Sib. iii. 620 f., 659 f.). "For Earth, the universal mother, shall give to mortals her best fruit in countless store of corn, wine, and oil" (Sib. iii. 744). The conditions of the new aion are predominantly of a particularistic national character. "The sons of the Great God shall live quietly around the temple, rejoicing in those gifts which He shall give, who is the Creator and sovereign righteous Judge" (Sib. iii. 702–705). Here, as in Daniel, the kingdom, the sovereignty, is given to Israel as the people of the Most High. "For the average piety," says Bousset, "national and earthly hopes held the field" (*Rel. d. J.*, p. 249). "In the older portions of 1 Enoch the earthly, sensual 'Messianic' hopes prevail" (*ibid.*, p. 287). In these material blessings we may see what in the aion-festival of the Earth- and Harvest-God in Egypt, in the Kronos-Helios festival in Syria, was popularly hoped and prayed for.[1]

Founding on Wellhausen's observation that the God to whom the festival underlying Hanukkah referred is the Bel-semin, of whom Zeus is a representative (Lidzbarski, *Eph. für Sem. Epig.*, i. p. 251; cf. Baethgen, *Beitr. zur sem. Religionsgesch.*, p. 82 f.), and upon the fact that the festival of Kronos fell on the tenth day after the beginning of winter in Syria, where Bel and Kronos were one and the same deity (*Φοίνικες καὶ Σύροι τὸν Κρόνον Ἢλ καὶ βῆλ βωλαθὴν ἐπονομάζουσιν*; Damasc., *Vit. Isid.*, p. 343b, 21 Bek.; cf. *I.E.M.*, p. 179), it is now possible to state our conclusions regarding the deity honoured by the festival which Hanukkah of 25th Kislev interpreted.

---

[1] John of Gaza, v. 140 f., describes Aion as a half-naked youthful year- and time-God (*I.E.R.*, p. 201; cf. p. 202): "Man gewinnt auch für Syrien, wo die Gleichsetzung von Kronos und Helios voll gesichert ist, den Eindruck eines Fruchtbarkeits- und Zeitgottes, der später auch in der Sonne waltend gedacht wird." Cf. Pohlenz (*Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll R.E.*, art. "Kronos") for Kronos as "Wetter- und Erntegott." The Attic Kronia reveal Kronos as god for whom the harvest thanksgiving festival is set apart and celebrated. The Kronos coin of Himera depicts the god of the earth's fruitfulness.

1. As Kronos-Helios, the god of the heathen festival was the Hellenistic equivalent of the Jewish "Hypsistos" or "Most High," whose title and quality, according to Cumont,[1] also bear the mark of Chaldean-Iranian influence.

2. As Zarvan (Bel)-Kronos, he is the Time- and Eternity-God, who in the naturalistic aspect of religion is the lord of the year and its fruits, and in the cosmological aspect the god of the world-periods, of the new order or age. As descending from his festival, the festival of Hanukkah stands in closer relationship than that of contemporaneity with the apocalyptic thought of the period in which it arose.

The references of Daniel to the God to whom Antiochus did homage, conform with the assumption that the Bel-semin, the "Shikkuz-shomem" in whose worship the king had sought the religious unity of his peoples, was Kronos-Helios. For, that the god Antiochus honoured was not a purely Hellenic divinity may be understood from the statement (Dan. xi. 38) that the ancestors of Antiochus had not worshipped this deity. Having regard to the astral character which, as Boll has shown, was inherent in Kronos-Helios, we can understand the Daniel passage, as Gressmann (*Die hellen. Gestirnreligion*, p. 19) does, as making allusion to this feature. "The astral religion Antiochus could, in fact, esteem to be the general Hellenistic type, and from his viewpoint had to demand its acceptance from the Jews, while Daniel could with equal right affirm that the astral religion also in Syria was new, and that Antiochus had adopted a religion his fathers had not known."[1] Also in the description of the Bel-semin as a "God of Fortresses" (xi. 38) the strangeness of the God is defined. This appears to characterize the divinity as war-like, and Gressmann observes that Philo Byblios calls the Phœnician Kronos a powerful tyrant, and also that Sib. iii. 97–154 depicts the warlike nature of Kronos. There we read (ver. 121) that "Kronos and Titan fought each other," that "the sons of Kronos . . . raised up for him a great war and battle din. And this is the beginning of war to all mortals" (vers. 152–154). But it is possible that the "God of Fortresses" (אלה מעזים; cf. ver. 39, מבצרי מעזים)[2]

---

[1] In art. "Kronos," *P.-W.-Kroll*, Cumont states that, when under the influence of Chaldean astrology and Persian Mazdæism the idea of the Heaven-God spread in Syria, "Hypsistos" became the Almighty World-ruler (als der allmächtige Weltherrscher aufgefasst), who has his seat in the light of the upper sphere, and who from there guides the movement of the stars, and thereby guides and creates all upon the earth.

---

[1] Gressmann, *loc. cit.*: "Diese Gestirnreligion konnte Antiochus in der Tat als die allgemein hellenistische bezeichnen und musste von seinem Standpunkte aus die Teilnahme an ihr auch von den Juden fordern, während Daniel umgekehrt mit demselben Rechte betonen konnte, dass die Gestirnreligion auch in Syrien neu sei und dass Antiochos einem Gott huldige, den seine Väter noch nicht gekannt hätten." Cf. Anm. 3, *ibid.*

[2] Dan. xi. 38: ולאלה מעזים על־כנו יכבד. Bevan (*Journal of Hellen. Studies*, 1900, p. 29) explains the "difficult" על־כנו as "in his place," *i.e.* Antiochus identified himself with Zeus, putting himself "on the same basis" as the god (cf. *H.B.D.*, "Money," Kennedy. Rev. of tetradrachm of Ant. Epiphanes (N. 5)—Zeus "holding a Nike, who crowns him"). But while this would interpret the statement "magnifies himself above every god," it does not cast light on "whom his fathers knew not," for Bevan (p. 28) himself speaks of documental evidence for the worship of Seleukos, "the founder of the Seleucid dynasty, as Zeus Nikator." But A.'s unification of the religions of his realm was an infringement of the rights of every god and a self-magnification. In על־כנו (perhaps corrupted from על כנו in vers. 20, 21) there may be concealed the name of the God of Fortresses אל־כיון (or בעל־), El-Kevan (cf. Amos v. 26; Kittel, *Bib. Heb.*). Kevan "is probably another name of the god Ninib, to whom Saturn was holy" (*Schr. d. A.T.*, Haller, on Amos v. 26; cf. p. 408 f.). Jensen (*Kosmologie*, p. 136 f.) holds Saturn to be the planet of Ninib. A. Jeremias (*Roscher*, Bd. iii. 1, "Ninib," col. 368) affirms Ninib's planet to be Mars. Ninib in hymns is God of War, and the Greeks call him Kronos (*ibid.*). Cf. כון = Berota, Beirut, a foundation of Kronos.

is Bel-Kronos the Founder of strong and eternal cities, the Babels which thought they could not fall. The great imperial significance which the title "eternal city" was to acquire as applied to Rome, and later to Constantinople, is traced by Reitzenstein (*I.E.M.*, p. 228) to the thought of Kronos-Zarvan-Aion as the founder and protector of towns which claimed to be founded from the beginning of time ("in der Urzeit der Welt entstanden zu sein," *ib.*, p. 179 f.)—a conception which had grown to maturity in Syria and Phœnicia in the early Hellenistic age. Byblos and Berytos were such foundations.

III

In the reaction from the condition of political suppression, in the Messianic nature of its national hopes, intensified by Apocalyptic visionaries, of whom Daniel cannot have been the sole example, Judaism had rich resources of experience and theological thought from which to interpret and endow the New-Age conceptions of the Kronos-Helios festivals. On the first occasion of the 25th Kislev after the deliverance, the nation could make such a festival its own in a very real sense, transforming and investing the Gentile customs with a new meaning and placing upon them the mark of allegiance to Jahveh. At the beginning, the Jewish festival, when expectations had been realized, would necessarily possess more completely the nature of a New-Age celebration, the Hanukkah of a new world-period, than it would possess in the succeeding years. The three and a half years of Daniel's prophecy were now fulfilled. The new Aion was already at the doors. The *ἐξουσία αἰώνιος* (Theod. trans. of Dan. vii. 14, שלטנה שלטן עלם) to be given to the people of the Most-High, the *βασιλεία* (*ib.*, מלכותה)

that would not fade away, was at hand. Already before, when Judea had been passing from the Egyptian to the Syrian government (Antiochus III., 222–187 B.C.), some, taking advantage of the troubled situation, had sought to realize the Messianic kingdom (Dan. xi. 14). It was a false dawn, heralded by false men. Herzfeld and Wellhausen (cf. *Nachr.*, p. 123) think that the Tobiad Hyrkanus, a meteoric figure of which little is known, had appeared as a Messiah. But now with Judas—"le jour de gloire est arrivé." As after the Exile the building of the temple had seemed to be a condition (Zech. vi. 9–14; Hag. ii. 20–23) of the "Heilzeit," and of David's kingdom being established, so now the temple is restored to worship, its cultus reinstituted. Judas Makkabi (the mason's mallet)[1] the Builder, true to the traditions of the past, and the example of Nehemiah, builds a high wall skirting the hill of the temple, and towers to protect it from the garrison in the Acra (1 M. vi. 7 f.; Jos. *Ant.* xii. 7. 7). Jonathan, his successor, followed his example (1 M. x. 10 f.). That these works, besides being precautionary and defensive, must be regarded as belonging to the conception of a Jerusalem in a new era, appears from Tob. xiii. 15, 16, which bases on older prophecies. The dates 16th Adar, the beginning of the building of the walls of Jerusalem, the 7th Ijjar, the day of the Hanukkah of the walls, commemorated in the Chronicle of Feasts (Meg. Taʿan. vi. xii.; cf. Derenbourg, *Essai*, p. 74, note 2; Dalman, *Aramäische Dialekt.*, p. 42 f.) may one or both refer to Hasmonean times.

---

[1] For discussion of meaning of Makkabi, cf. Schürer, *Gesch. d. jüd. Volkes*, Bd. iv. ed. S. 402, 204. Weightier than Curtiss' preference for מכבי = "Extinguisher," Schürer regards C.'s objection that מקבה is not the large smith's hammer (פטיש) but the small workman's hammer, but asks whether this objection can be considered decisive. But מקבת is the stone-cutter's mallet (Jastrow, *Talm. Dict.*; cf. Kel. xxix. 7). In a description of an illustrious character, not מקבה, but פטיש is used in Ber. 28b: "Thou light of Israel, righteous pillar, powerful hammer (פטיש החזק)." The "mason's hammer" as surname of Judas (cf. 1 M. iv. 60, vi. 7, vi. 22) would be particularly applicable to him as the founder of the Jewish state. A. Bevan, *J.O.T.S.* (30), 1928–29, p. 191 f., offers a biblical explanation of the name, deriving it from Isa. lxii. 2.

At this time a personal Messiah was not one of the essential elements of the eschatological hopes of Judaism (cf. Joel; Sirach xxxiii.; Isa. xxiv.–xxvii.; 1 Enoch i.–xxxvi.; Tobit; Judith). In Daniel the people of Israel are the bearers of the Messianic power. But the tone of the religious hopes and the political aspirations are strongly Messianic. The present is seen in a Messianic light, and from the near future the very highest is expected (1 Enoch xc.; Jub. xxiii.; cf. Bousset, *R. d. Jud.*, p. 204). This spirit is modified when the pious again feel themselves to be oppressed, and are disappointed by the worldly aims and character of the rulers. That the world-aion is extended by writers after Daniel is but a sign of the passage of time which allowed of maturer reflection. But yet at least "in certain periods and by a wide circle of the pious" (Bousset, *ib.*, p. 223) the Maccabean princes were regarded as a Messianic race. Josephus' description of John Hyrkanus as prophet, priest, and king is exhaustive of the attributes of Messianic power, and is a tradition that did not arise with that writer, but is reflective of the claims and hopes of the Hasmonean period. The princes held the priesthood and the sovereignty. "Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek" (Ps. cx. 4) may refer to Simon [1] (cf. Charles, *Assum. Mos.* vi. 1). In the ode in honour of Simon (1 M. xiv. 6 f.), which probably derives from a date much earlier than the context in which it is contained (cf. Introd. to 1 M.,

---

[1] Briggs (*Psalms*, vol. ii. p. 374 f.) regards "after the order of Melchizedek" as gloss, and rejects Maccabean reference even in the gloss.

Kautzsch), the picture of his rule is Messianic: "Old men sat in the streets and spoke together of the (common) weal. . . . And Israel rejoiced with great joy, and each sat under his vine and his fig tree."

It was not till the days of Jonathan, Judas' immediate successor, that the office of high-priest, through the politic offer of Alexander Balas, fell into the possession of the Hasmoneans. Alexander Balas had had a profounder insight into Jonathan's ambition than his rival Demetrius. But already we see in Judas' struggle with Alcimus the high-priest, in the competition of both for the allegiance of the "pious," in Judas' sending ambassadors to Rome, and in his being succeeded without question by Jonathan, that Judas had meant to attach the power of ruler to his house. The exaltation of the family of Jojarib (1 Chron. xxiv. 7), to which the Hasmoneans belonged, to the first class of the priesthood, Meyer (*Ursprung*, Bd. ii. p. 230) connects with the modest statement of 1 M. iv. 42 that Judas "chose blameless priests such as had delight in the Law."[1] Soon after the victory over the Syrians, the Hasidim were made aware that the vindication of the Law was not the beginning and end of Judas' aims. It was only after their alliance with Alcimus had proved an impossibility that they yielded to Judas' government. Their opposition is explained by his personal aspirations. They had doubtless rested in the thought that the saints of the Most High were the fountain of authority, or that a ruler of the House of David would arise, or, failing this, that a purified priesthood would provide the governance. At length they must accept the realities of the situation. The growing conception of the Hasmoneans as the Messianic race, taking fuller expression in the days of Jonathan, gaining more general acknowledgment in the reign of Simon, can only have had its origin with the Makkabi, the liberator himself, and his adherents. His campaigns against the Edomites and the Ammonites, his bringing back the dispersed of Israel from the east Jordanland, reveal him as ideal ruler. His appeal to Rome was not now in the interests of liberty of worship, but to shake off the Syrian yoke altogether and make his position certain.[1] His successors reaped no more than Judas had desired.

---

[1] *Loc. cit.*: "Somit kann nicht zweifelhaft sein, dass diese Ordnung, die in der Chronik. i. 24, natürlich auf David zurückgeführt wird, in Wirklichkeit von Judas und seinen Nachfolgern geschaffen ist. Anschaulich tritt dadurch hervor, dass die Auswahl 'untadeliger gesetzestreuer Priester' bei der Wiederherstellung des Kultus eine tiefgreifende Umgestaltung der Hierarchie bedeutet hat."

In the sovereignty which seemed now possible for the nation by the victory of Judas, if not, in the narrower sense, for the Hasmoneans themselves, it is probable that we have the idea which gave significance to the lamp which was substituted for the pagan custom it dethroned. On the altars of Apollo, the patron deity of the defeated Seleucid dynasty, without doubt on the monthly king's-birthday incense had been burned. Now, the lamp became a sign of the Malkuth Jahveh, the sovereignty of His people and of the Law in the new age, or, though not generally, perhaps in the minds of some of "the pious," the preparation of a lamp for a son of David. Olmstead, in a sketch of Maccabean times, describes the disappointment of the Hasidim and Pharisees in the successors of Judas, the hopes of the pious that a genuine descendant of Aaron would again be priest, and a descendant of David, king. "They consoled themselves by penning in the margins (of the sacred scrolls) promises that David should again reign in Jerusalem, 'which I have chosen to place my Name,' 'for my servant David's sake,' 'that David my servant may have a lamp always before me in Jerusalem.' Or less frequently they inserted longer passages, such as, 'If thou wilt walk in my statutes and execute my ordinances and keep all my commandments to walk in them, then will I establish my word with thee which I spake unto David thy father, and I will dwell among the children of Israel' " (cf. 1 Kings vi. 11–13).[1] By Daniel the supreme government of Jahveh and the saints is all that is foreshadowed for the new aion. But it was impossible for Hasidim or others to remain content with this bare notion of the divine sovereignty over Israel. In Ps. cxxxii. 17, "I have ordained a lamp for mine anointed" is a gloss, according to Briggs (*Psalms*, vol. ii. p. 472), from the pen of "a Maccabean writer." The assurance of 1 Kings xi. 36, xv. 4; 2 Kings viii. 19; 2 Chron. xxi. 7, that David will always have a lamp before Jahveh in Jerusalem, was an expression of the belief of the continuance of the Davidic House. The lamp that had connexion with the rites for the dead and had supplied the metaphor for the continuance of an individual's life in his posterity, had become symbol, in the case of the royal line, of the permanence of the dynasty. In 2 Sam. xxi. 17, David is adjured not to risk his person any more in battle, "that thou quench not the lamp of Israel" (נר ישראל). As we may judge from 1 Kings xi. 36, xv. 4; Ps. cxxxii. 17, the expression "lamp of Israel" had attained Messianic character.[2] In the two passages, 1 Kings xi. 36, xv. 4, writes G. H.

---

[1] Cf. Schürer, *Gesch.*, Bd. i. S. 220: "Das Ziel, welches er dabei im Auge hatte, war ausgesprochenermassen die Abschüttelung des syrischen Joches" (1 M. viii. 18).

---

[1] *American Journal of Theology*, vol. xxiv. Jan. 1920, p. 110.

[2] A. Jeremias, *Das Alte Test. im Lichte des alten Orients*, 3rd ed. p. 475, on "lamp of Israel," 2 Sam. xxi. 17 (Anm. 4): "Der Ausdruck hat nach 1 Kings xi. 36, xv. 4; Ps. cxxxii. 17 (Parallele Horn Davids) messianischen Charakter."

Dix,[1] the lamp is associated with David and Solomon, and is described as being in Jerusalem, that is, it is found in the temple as the symbol of the Spirit's presence with the king and, through the king, with the people. So also the author of Ps. cxxxii. 17, he continues, associates the Messiah to come, the "new David," endowed with the Spirit of Jahveh, with the lamp, and "it would therefore appear that the lamp which burned in the sanctuary had come to be the symbol of the Spirit who indwelt the kings and who would again indwell the Messiah in the new age." From this viewpoint it may thus seem possible to regard the Rabbinic legends which explain Hanukkah as commemorative of "the sons of (or 'the kingdom of the house of,' cf. p. 77 f., *supra*) Hasmonai" relighting the temple-lamps, as having reduced to incident the spiritual idea and religious imagery which are the true significance of the Hanukkah lights. In the vision of Zechariah iv., the two olive trees (Joshua and Zerubbabel) supply with oil the lamps of the seven-branched golden lamp-stand. Joshua and Zerubbabel are the "sons of the oil," the two elect anointed ones who will maintain and represent the sovereignty of Jahveh in the Messianic age which is about to break upon the returned exiles. This image of divinely appointed rule which in Zechariah iv. attaches to the seven-branched lamp-stand and which connects (see Dix, *ibid.*, p. 246 f.) with the older symbolism of the single lamp, is employed centuries later by the writer of the Apocalypse to denote the government of God and its immanence. There (Rev. iv. 5; cf. i. 4, iii. 1, v. 6) the seven lamps of fire, which are the seven Spirits of God who go forth into all the earth, are "burning before the throne." That the hopes awakened by the triumphs of the "sons of Hasmonai," in that period which must, and which alone can, call forth comparison with the time of Joshua and Zerubbabel, resorted to the familiar symbolism of sovereignty may seem certain. The selection, later, of Zech. ii. 10–iv. 7 as Haphtarah lesson for Hanukkah, if its witness be accepted at all (see below), supports the conclusion that this comparison was made and the ancient symbolism revived.

---

[1] *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. xxviii. 1927, "The Seven Archangels and the Seven Spirits," p. 247. Cf. Dr. Stanley Cook, *Enc. Bib.*, art. "Candlestick."

The Habinenu prayer (abbreviated Shemone Esre; Dalman, *Worte Jesu*, 238), which reflects conditions when it was yet possible for a Davidic prince to arise, makes petition for "the sprouting of a horn for David, Thy servant, and the preparation of Thy lamp for the son of Jesse, Thine anointed." But it was the Hasmonean dynasty which evoked in the "pious" the longing for a Davidic ruler (Ps. Sol. xvii.), and which caused in those who hated its government the fervent supplication for the preparation of a lamp for David. From this language of opposition we may suppose that the Hanukkah-lamp, which was the symbol of the sovereignty of Jahveh and his Law, had become the symbol of the Hasmonean rule itself, which, whatever its later demerits, had at first seemed the visible expression of the Malkuth Jahveh, and of the beginning of the new age.

IV

The explanation Josephus gives of Hanukkah gains a peculiar interest when we regard this festival as a new-age festival, and in view of the significance which we have inferred for the lamp. "They made it a law for their posterity that they should keep a festival on account of the restoration of their temple-worship, for eight days. And from that time to this we celebrate this festival and call it Lights. I suppose the reason was, because this liberty beyond our hopes appeared to us, and that thence was the name given to that festival"[1] (*καὶ ἐξ ἐκείνου μέχρι δεῦρο τὴν ἑορτὴν ἄγομεν καλοῦντες αὐτὴν φῶτα: ἐκ τοῦ παρ' ἐλπίδας οἶμαι ταύτην ἡμῖν φανῆσαι τὴν ἐξουσίαν, τὴν προσηγορίαν θέμενοι τῇ ἑορτῇ*). The Lights (*φῶτα*) Josephus regards as symbol of the freedom of worship (cf. with *ταύτην . . . τὴν ἐξουσίαν* the *ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ γενόμενοι τῆς θρησκείας* preceding) which unexpectedly lighted upon the nation. The "I suppose" (*οἶμαι*) may, as Hochfeld (*Z.A.W.*, 1902, p. 272) thinks, reveal that the author is simply giving his opinion for what it is worth ("auf seine eigenen Kosten"). It would appear also that Josephus' statement is not unrelated to the notice, in the Jewish Calendar, of a joyous day (28 Adar. Meg. Taʿan. xii.) commemorative of official permission having been granted to the Jews (by Antiochus V. ?) to retain their own laws. But that the lamp was just a symbol to the Jews of joy on account of national deliverance and freedom of worship, we may agree with most critics, is improbable.

It is possible that Josephus' suggestion represented the full extent of his knowledge of the origin of the lamp, and that he is making the most of his source 1 M.—the phrase *καὶ ἐφαίνοσαν ἐν τῷ ναῷ* in iv. 50 and the reference, in vi. 59, to the Syrian Government withdrawing its proscriptions against the Law and making peace with Judas. But, on the other hand, we may have here another instance where, on account of his Græco-Roman readers and his knowledge of the sad history of his people's Messianic hopes, he is veiling the facts. It is well known that where the Messianic element was the essence of the historical conditions he described, it was his method to pass over it in silence (cf. Schürer, *Gesch.*, 4th ed. Bd. i. p. 94). The political aspirations that attached to that hope had been the cause of the revolt against Rome, and it was ever the author's aim to refrain from casting them into relief and to avoid making his nation appear hostile to the governing power. In this regard he is accustomed to giving a distorted picture (Schürer, *ibid.*, "ein schiefes Bild"; cf. Hölscher, *Der Sadduzäismus*, p. 38) of history. But from his appropriate application of the prophecy of Daniel (*Ant.* xii. 7. 6) to the events preceding Hanukkah, a prophecy to which he points as having foretold the Macedonian persecution and the abolition of Jewish worship, it may be surmised that he was well aware that the Messianic content of Daniel's vision concerning the after events had inspired the suffering and the restored nation. The ἐξουσία (cf. *O′* and Θ to Dan. vii. 14) which this writing proclaimed was more than an ἐξουσία Θρησκείας, more than "right of worship." Josephus' explanation of "the lights" may reveal his real uncertainty as to their meaning. Or it may be a considered under-statement, due to his following, as in like circumstances, his usual course. On our conclusions as to the nature of Hanukkah as a Jewish aion-festival, which necessarily had for his race a Messianic undertone, we could not expect to find in Josephus what it was his habit to suppress. The two words ἐξουσία and Θρησκεία (virtually, the Law), which are capable of explaining the symbol of the lamp, he has combined into a colourless *tertium quid*.

---

[1] Whiston's translation of Jos. *Ant.* xii. 7. 7.

The lessons from Scripture, which Jewish worship chose for the commemoration of the festivals, are important for the testimony they render to the character of the events they commemorate. It is claimed for the oral tradition and use of these

Scripture portions that they go well back into pre-Christian times, though their written tradition is not earlier than the second century A.D., and that though their first reference is to other historical situations, they are capable of yielding evidence of a particular kind. St. John Thackeray, who (*Septuagint and Jewish Worship*, Schweich Lectures, 1920, p. 40 f.) deplores the neglect of the lectionary for exegesis on the part of English commentators, employs the lesson for Pentecost and Booths to illustrate the root-conceptions underlying these celebrations. We may therefore examine whether the theme of the lessons assigned by tradition to Hanukkah supports the interpretation we have given to that festival. The lesson from the Torah (Num. vii.) (cf. Meg. 30b) to which the festival-reading for a second Sabbath in Hanukkah (1 Kings vii.) is akin in content, we have already observed, has a bearing upon the meaning of חנך as applied to a temple or altar. The ideas of both passages are plenishing of the House, completion of the work (Num. vii. 1; cf. 1 Kings vii. 51), and institution of the service. In Ps. xxx, "the song of the Hanukkah of the House," the liturgical use of which is assigned by Sopherim xviii. 2 to the Maccabean festival, we have but the grand mood of exaltation consequent on national restoration. Israel returns as from Sheol to the realm of renewed life and light. It is in the Haphtarah-reading for the first Sabbath in Hanukkah (Zech. ii. 14–iv. 7; A.V. ii. 10–iv. 7) that we are first given the opportunity of tracing the theological conceptions that underlie Hanukkah as festival more fully, and are justified in seeing more than the desire to commemorate a time when trouble was changed to joy. Krauss (*R.E.J.*, "Fête de Hanoucca," xxx. 1895) thinks the reason for the choice of this lesson was the opening words, "Sing and rejoice, O daughter of Zion," and comments, as remarkable, that the fourth chapter was not read to the end, though the lamp-stand which stands between the "two anointed ones" is mentioned in verse 11. He suggests that the selection was made in the desire simply to characterize Hanukkah as a joyous feast, a "fête de réjouissance." But both outward marks of the festival, the lamps (iv. 2) no less than the joy, are done ample justice. Suitable, however, as the lesson in these two particulars is, a glance at the passage in the light of the history of Hanukkah, and its nature as aion-festival, shows its singular appropriateness. It is a picture of a new Messianic era, under the anointed priest, Joshua, and the anointed king, Zerubbabel. Joshua the high-priest, who has his "filthy garments" (iii. 3) taken away that he might be clothed with a change of raiment, certainly represented in the time after the Hasmonean revolt a new priesthood cleansed from the defilement of Jason and Menelaos. The Hasmoneans from the time of Jonathan, to the satisfaction for a time of even the strictly "pious," held in their person the office of both the anointed ones, as priests and kings. It is the Messianic character of Zechariah's prophecy which commended the lection, the vision of a new glorious age when the temple has been restored. The vision then had not been fulfilled. Now it was to be accomplished. The predominant note, the reason above all for the selection of the lesson, is in the opening words (ii. 14; A.V. ii. 10), when cited uncurtailed, where the beginning of a new aion is triumphantly heralded: "Sing and rejoice, O daughter of Zion: for, lo, I come, and I will dwell in the midst of thee, saith the Lord." The sovereignty of Jahveh, the Malkuth Jahveh, is announced (cf. Isa. xxiv. 23) as at hand.

The Pesikta of Rab Kahana, which reflects very old Midrashic tradition, might have been expected in its expositions to liberate thought upon the central meaning of our festival or the meaning of its ritual. Taking as text for Hanukkah, "And it came to pass upon the day that Moses had completed" (Num. vii. 1, ויהי ביום כלת משה), and, through the medium of rendering כלת משה as "bride of Moses," then expounding Cant. v. 1, "I am come into my garden, my sister, bride," the Pesikta does not appear at first sight, here or in its further exegesis, to have any but a superficial contact with the festival. "It is very striking," L. Venetianer says,[1] "that among the many fragments of homilies on the festival of Hanukkah not one is to be found which has reference to the 'lamps of Zechariah' (Zech. ii. 14–iv. 7; Meg. 31a), or of Solomon (1 Kings vii.), or to the Hanukkah-lamp, or to the significance of the festival at all." Instead there are many expositions of the Song of Solomon. But Venetianer rightly draws attention to what is seen to be the kernel thought and unifying idea of the homiletic passages. It appears (cf. Wünsche, p. 6) in the interrogations and answers: "Who ascends into heaven? It is God, as is said in Ps. xlvii. 6: 'God is gone up with a shout.' And who descends? Ex. xix. 20 (says): 'And the Eternal descended, etc.'" The Pesikta then pursues the subject, showing from Scripture that Moses and Elijah were those that ascended to heaven, and also descended (2 Kings i. 15; Ex. xix. 14). This, however, is but an after-flow from a larger preceding section (Wünsche, p. 2), where it is explained that once the Presence of God, the Shekinah, dwelt on earth, but on account of the sinfulness of seven succeeding generations of the human race, withdrew stage by stage to the seventh heaven. Then again seven generations appeared, with each a righteous forefather of Israel, and through their merit, the Shekinah descended stage by stage, till at last Moses came and brought with him the Shekinah down to the earth. Venetianer is at a loss to account for this theme having connexion with Hanukkah, and believes it to be a Jewish polemic against the doctrine of the ascension of Christ.[1] But there is not the faintest trace of a polemic. Nor is his explanation feasible that these sections became detached from the season of the year in which Ascension Day, in the Church, appears, and attached themselves to the Hanukkah festival of Kislev. But, in fact, the application of Ps. xlvii. 6, and the story of the Shekinah on earth, could not more perfectly agree with the significance of Hanukkah as Aion-festival. We may compare with the theme of the expositions the "Lo, I come, and will dwell in the midst of thee, saith the Lord," of the Haphtarah-passage (Zech. ii. 14 (10)). At the very beginning of the homilies (Wünsche, p. 1), "I will come into my garden, etc." (Cant. v. 1), is interpreted of the Shekinah descending to earth. Later, in another fragment, "On the day when Moses had completed" (Wünsche, p. 7), is expounded thus: "So long as the tabernacle (the dwelling) was not erected, there was enmity, jealousy, strife, discord, and disorder in the world, but after the tabernacle was erected, there returned love, tenderness, friend-ship, righteousness, and peace to the world." This was brought about by the משכן, the dwelling of God, being set up among men.

---

[1] "Ursprung und Bedeutung der Propheten-Lektionen," *Z.D.M.G.*, Bd. lxiii. 1909, p. 146 f.

---

[1] Venetianer, *ut sup.*, p. 146: "Dieses Rätsel löst uns der oben zitierte 47. Psalm der in der römisch-katholischen Kirche als Introitus, Halleluja und Offertorium gesungen wird am Himmelsfahrtstage (In Ascensione Domini) welches Fest noch zum Osterfestkreis gerechnet werden kann. Die Synagoge durfte nicht schweigen; sie musste es beweisen, dass nicht Jesus derjenige war, der die Shekinah herunterbrachte sondern Gott, Mose, und Elijahu."

The Shekinah of these Pesikta homilies on Hanukkah is quite clearly the equivalent of Dike (*Δίκη*, Aratus, Phain. 96 f.), who in the golden age had her abode with men, remained yet with them in the age of silver, though withdrawing to the mountains, but when the age of iron came, took flight to the heavens, and shines there as *παρθένος* among the constellations.[1] We recognize in it the figure of Wisdom (cf. Sirach xxiv. 7–11), of whom 1 Enoch xlii. 2 (Charles, 105–64 B.C.) says:

> "Wisdom went forth to make her dwelling among the children of men
> And found no resting-place.
> Wisdom returned to her place
> And took her seat among the angels"—

whence she will return to men in the Messianic times (v. 8, xlviii. 1, xlix. 1 f., xci. 10; cf. 2 Bar. xliv. 14; 4 Ezra viii. 52). The mythology of the golden age, combining with Iranian teaching,[2] comes to complete expression in Jewish theology. From the Pesikta, through the Haphtarah back to the Book of Daniel with its four world-periods (Dan. ii.), and the four kingdoms (Dan. vii.) succeeded by the *ἐξουσία αἰώνιος*, runs the same thread of thought leading back to the equation of Bel-Kronos with Zarvan, and the spread throughout the Orient of the Aion-concept.

---

[1] Cf. art. Δίκη by Thalheim in *P.-W.*

[2] See Georg Beer in Kautzsch, *Pseudep.*, Bd. ii. p. 261, on Enoch xlii. note k.

CHAPTER VIII

THE FESTIVAL OF THE NEW AGE (*continued*)

CHAPTER VIII

The Festival of the New Age (*continued*)

I

We are now able to bring into relationship with a Kronos-Helios festival those elements which left their trace in the ritual of Hanukkah. Kronos-Helios, as Heaven-God, was Lord of the year, and Light-God (*I.E.R.*, p. 179 f.; Weber, *ut sup.*, p. 325, "Herrscher über das Jahr"), a god of fruitfulness and fecundity.[1] In the Jewish Apocalyptic, as already observed, the yearnings are not only for a new world-period, in which national and Messianic aspirations are to be fulfilled, but the new era will bring abundant earthly blessings—fruits, corn, wine, milk, honey, herds (3 Sib. 619 f.). The naturalistic and material motif which even in Jewish conceptions of the New Age is predominant, represents what in heathen thought was regarded as the character of the new aion (cf. Verg. *IV. Ecl.* v. 18z f.) and the benefits which it was the object of the Kronos festivals to promote. In Hellenized Egypt, where the Aion-festival took place on the 5th–6th January, the liturgic call, "the virgin has brought forth the Aion," without doubt signified that the kingdom of light had conquered, and that the powers of darkness were now put to flight.

---

[1] Reitzenstein, *I.E.R.*, p. 202: "Man gewinnt besonders für Syrien, wo die Gleichsetzung von Kronos und Helios voll gesichert ist, den Eindruck eines Fruchtbarkeit- und Zeitgottes, der später auch in der Sonne waltend gedacht ist."

In Syria the festival on the 18th of November at the beginning of the New Year celebrated the God's beneficence in sending the winter's rain to fructify the earth. From the character of Kronos-Helios, as God of time and fecundity, Lord of the year and the seasons, we can understand the place which honours to Dionysus and Apollo would occupy in his festival. These two Gods had, in Delphi, whence the worship of Dionysus came to Asia Minor, the year roughly divided between them, the spring, summer, and early autumn belonging to Apollo, the rest of the autumn and winter to Dionysus. Farnell (*H.B.D.*, "Rel. of Greece," extra vol. p. 144) speaks of Apollo's "vegetative and agricultural character" as clearly attested. Apollo himself is even regarded as God of the cycle of the year ("Kreislauf des Jahres," Wernicke, "Apol.," *P.-W.*). This is true also of Dionysus, who in the Delphic cult-saga is conceived of as dying, and being brought back again to life, thus symbolizing Nature's seasons of decay and growth. He, too, is a God of vegetation. Icaria, the most fruitful part of Attica, where the cult of Dionysus was most prominent, bears to-day the name Dionyso. In this relation to Nature and her fruits therefore, Apollo and Dionysus have a common character. "The two divinities have many of their titles and attributes in common: in the end the distinction between them seems to disappear entirely" (Rhode, *Psyche*, p. 287). Their near relationship is apparent in the application of κισσεύς, βακχεῖος, and κίσσιος to Apollo (cf. Epheu in *P.-W.*), whom Æschylus (frg. 341) calls "ivy-crowned Apollo, the Bacchic frenzied prophet." On the other hand, Bacchus is addressed by Euripides (*Likym. Frag.*, 2nd ed. Nauck, 477) as φιλόδαφνε βάκχε, as lover of the laurel (the cult-symbol of Apollo), and is equated with the Paian Apollo.

Both Gods are producers of sacred fire. In Thebes the solemn state-sacrifice was in honour of both divinities, and in various places (see Wernicke's list in col. 35, *ut sup.*) it was the custom to worship them together. At Delphi, where the birthday of Dionysus in-the-Cradle (*Διόνυσος Λικνίτης*) was celebrated in the month of the beginning of winter (*ἀρχομένου χειμῶνος*, Plut. *de Is. et Os.* 35. 365 A; *de E. ap. Delph.* 9. 389 A–C; Norden, *G. d. K.*, S. 36), that is, November, the front pediment of the temple showed the image of Apollo, the rearward that of Dionysus (Kern, "Dion.," col. 1017, *P.-W.*). At this sanctuary, according to the rhetorician Menandros (*Menand. Rhet.*, ed. Sprengel, iii. 446), the names Apollo and Dionysus were alternatives. Dr. J. Rendel Harris (*The Origin of the Cult of Apollo*, p. 15 f.) speaks of "the proved mythological consanguinity of the two gods," and exemplifies their exchanging of character and titles, the overlapping of their functions, the fusion of their personalities, not only from literature but from coinage. When, therefore, in Hanukkah we find traces of elements of the Dionysian and Apollo cult being taken over and judaized, these traces are of two closely related divinities who in later times are mentioned side by side, or even merged in one another (" beide gar mit einander identifiziert," Wernicke, *ib.*, col. 36). In the festival of the Bel-semin, who was Highest God and Lord of the year and its fruits, we discover reason for their presence in symbolizing the year's course and division. On an archaic Greek mirror (figured by Miss Harrison, *Themis*, p. 142) we see, as Dr. Harris (*l.c.*, p. 16, note 2) observes, "Apollo, Dionysus, and Helios in conjunction"; the first two deities are depicted facing each other, with the solar disk between them. On Rhodian coins Helios (=Apollo) is shown crowned with ivy and grapes in the Dionysian manner. As these representations also indicate, the relationship of Apollo and Dionysus to Helios and to the soil is the factor that must have been operative in their reconciliation, their fraternity, and at length in their sharing attributes and functions. Macrobius (*Sat.* i. 18. 1–6; 18. 8; cf. 18–22. See Whittaker, *Macrobius, or Philosophy, Science, and Letters in the Year 400*, p. 24), affirming that Apollo and Liber Pater are the same, and that Liber is the Sun, brings as proof of the latter statement that in a secret religious observance the Sun in the upper hemisphere is called Apollo, in the nocturnal hemisphere, Dionysus.

Where there was a Kronos-Helios festival it might be expected that honour should be made to Apollo, already long identified with Helios. In the Syrian festival of the Licinian edict (see above) there is mention made of an image of Sol and of celebrating the festival with candles, incense, and libations. The incense and libations, we may imagine, were offered before this image, which the soldiers set up in the midst of the camp. But in a Hellenized city these offerings would probably be made by the citizens, during the festive days, at the street altars of "Apollo of the Entrance" (Thuraios, Prostaterios). But what ignorance of the actual festival practice conceals from us, the mythology of the new age reveals, for this gives prominence to the Helios-figure. In Vergil's *Fourth Eclogue*, which Bousset (*Rel. d. Jud.*, S. 206)[1] regards as even possibly affected by Jewish hopes of the future and certainly by Oriental ideas, a Saviour is promised who will bring the golden age, the kingdom of

---

[1] *Loc. cit.*: "Sogar der römische Dichter Vergil ist in der eschatologischen Schilderung der Zukunft (Ecloge IV.) möglicherweise auch vom Zukunftsglauben des Judentums, sicher durch orientalische Ideen angeregt."

Saturn, the coming "Saturnia regna." This, however, is described as the reign of Apollo: "*tuus iam regnat Apollo.*" "Now the virgin returns, returns the kingdom of Saturn, now a new race descends from heaven's lofty height; do thou, then, O Lucina, regard with eye of grace this child's birth, by whom the iron age will die, a golden age arise; for now begins the reign of thine Apollo" (ver. 6 f.). The rule of Kronos (Saturn) is that of the Sun-child.

The Book of Daniel provides indication that with the entrance into Judaism of the Aion-concept, other conceptions of Chaldean-Iranian astral religion had penetrated Jewish thought in pre-Maccabean times. The picture of the ram and the goat which do battle with one another (Dan. viii.), and which represent respectively Persia and Greece (Syria), employs the symbolism of the astral geography and ethnology current in the Persian period.[1] But even the Kronos-Helios mythology itself would appear to have made a deep impression. A comparison of the 7th chapter of Daniel with the poem of Claudianus (*circa* A.D. 400), a late production, but one that uses ancient legendary material, may exemplify this.[2] To the honour of Stilicho and his consular year, Claudianus (*De Consulatu Stilichonis*, ii. 424–440) indites his poem, which gives the following picture. In a cavern remote and inaccessible to man, indeed almost to the very Gods themselves, dwells the infinite Aion (*ævum immensum*), the Eternity God. A serpent, tail in mouth, is coiled round the cave. The entrance is guarded by the year-laden Natura, to whose limbs attach fluttering spirits. The Time- and Eternity-God Himself is described as an Ancient One (*verendus senex*), who is writing unalterable laws (*mansura iura*), and establishes the courses of the stars on which living and perishing depend. But now appears the Sun-God, youthfully radiant, upon the threshold of the cave. Natura (Physis) goes to meet him, and the Ancient One inclines his head, crowned with white hair, before the glorious rays. The door of the cavern opens to the Sun-God, and, within, the thrones and secrets of the Aion are visible. Here are the world-ages (*sæcula*) distinguished as metals—bronze, iron, silver—and, in the inmost portion of the cavern, the years of gold but rarely vouchsafed. From these rarest treasures, the Sun-God takes the rarest piece and marks it with the name of Stilicho—the Consul of the coming year. The similarity of ideas in the poem of Claudianus and in Daniel is striking. In Dan. vii. the Lord of Time is an Ancient One, thrones also are set up, books are opened, and government is allotted. The Son of Man appears before the Ancient of Days and receives the eternal kingdom. In Dan. vii. four *kingdoms* are represented. But in Dan. ii. the description is rather of four world-ages, which are represented by metals. Gressmann (*Z.K.G.*, Bd. xli. p. 175) is of opinion that Claudianus, in moulding the legend to his purpose and to the circumstances of his own time, makes Stilicho, the Consul of the year, take the place originally given to the Sun-God, and the golden year take the place of the *sæculum*, the golden age.

---

[1] W. Baumgarten, *Das Buch Daniel*, p. 15: "Das ausgehende Altertum besass eine astrologische Geographie, die sich bis in die persische Zeit zurückfolgen lässt, in ihren Wurzeln aber sicher auf die babylonische Astrologie zurückgeht. Jedem Tierkreiszeichen war da ein besonderes Land unterstellt. Babylon stand unter dem Stier, Kleinasien unter dem Löwen, Ägypten unter dem Wassermann, Persien unter dem Widder, Syrien unter dem *Αἰγόκερως* (Steinbock Ziegenbock). Das Seleukidenreich vertritt—für den Orientalen begreiflich—das ganze Griechenland. Damit ist das Rätsel gelöst und wir sehen orientalische Astrologie in das Buch Daniel hineinspielen." Cf. Gressmann, *Die Hellen. Gestirnreligion*, p. 16.

[2] For the description in Claudianus, *De Cons. Stil.*, cf. Reitzenstein, *I.E.R.*, p. 183; Gressmann, *Die hellen. Gestirnrel.*, p. 17; *Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch.* xli. (N.F. IV.), 175 f.; *Die Aufgaben d. Wiss. d. nachbibl. Judentums*, 19 f. For poem, cf. Appendix II.

In the original *mythos*, Gressmann holds, Sol was the Messiah of the End-time, and the legend told of the enthroning of the youthful Sun-God and the bestowing upon him of power and government by the ancient God of Fates.[1] On this tradition both Daniel and Claudianus are dependent.[2] In both, the Ancient One is Zarvan, or, otherwise expressed, Kronos-(Helios). " No reader," says Norden, " can have the slightest suspicion that Vergil's *Eclogue* is the pattern for the scene " which Claudianus depicts.[3] The visions of all three writers, this means, according to Gressmann and Norden, are based upon conceptions and traditions of the Hellenistic astral religion, which is of Chaldean-Iranian origin. If the deduction Gressmann makes be accepted, we can perceive in the Sol of Claudianus' poem, the Apollo of Vergil's *Eclogue*, and the Bar 'Enash of Daniel's vision, the same Helios-figure. In all three writers the earthly bearers of government in the new age—the holy people of Israel,[1] the wonderful child of the *Eclogue*, Stilicho of the Alexandrian poet—have the same heavenly prototype. From this standpoint we can explain the presence and significance of the Apollo-rites in the festival which Hanukkah interpreted, and can regard Hanukkah as performing in the realm of festival practice that which Daniel's vision performs in the realm of Apocalyptic thought when it converts the Kronos-Helios new-age mythology to the religion of Jahveh.

---

[1] *Loc. cit.*: " Auch bei Claudianus handelt es sich ursprünglich um das goldene saeculum, und nur die Rücksicht auf das Konsulatsjahr hat das Zeitalter in ein Jahr verwandelt. Ebenso deutlich ist auf den ersten Blick, dass Stilicho den Sonnengott verdrängt hat; in der Vorlage war Sol der endzeitliche Messias." Cf. also Norden, *G. d. K.*, p. 43, note 1. *Die hellen. Gest.*, pp. 17, 18: " Es ist klar dass der Dichter einen überlieferten Stoff behandelt hat und leicht umgebogen hat; Der Sinn der Szene war demnach ursprünglich die Einsetzung des jugendlichen Sonnengottes zum Herrn der herrlichen Endzeit durch den greisen Schicksalsgott." " Das babylonische Urbild dieser Szene ist längst bekannt und doch bisher nicht erkannt: Die Einsetzung des jugendlichen Marduk sum Schicksalslenker oder Weltherrscher im Schöpfungsmythus."

[2] Gressmann, *Z. K. Gesch.*, p. 176: " Claudianus und Daniel müssen aus derselben Quelle geschöpft haben; auch bei diesem kann der Hochbetagte niemand anders sein als Aion-Zrvan." Cf. *Hell. Gest.*, p. 19: " Belsamin . . . war als Kronos-Helios im Grunde vom Hochbetagten nicht unterschieden."

[3] *Loc. cit.*: " Kein Leser des Epos kann auch nur auf den leisesten Gedanken kommen, die virgilische Ekloge sei das Vorbild dieser Szene gewesen. Sie bietet vielmehr ein abhängiges Zeugnis für die auch die Ekloge beherrschende Vorstellung, dass Helios aus dem Urgrunde der Ewigkeit das goldene Zeitalter als erstes der neuen Weltperiode emporführt."

It is evident that new-age conceptions which became widely spread through the Kronos-Helios mythology and cult would necessarily make connexion with the idea of *divine king*. In the Assyrian-Babylonian world the latter idea of *divine king*, early attested, seems after *circa* 2000 B.C. to recede, and for a long time apparently to disappear.[2] But later we meet with the description of Assurbanipal (668–626) as having been nourished "at the breasts of the goddess, the queen of Nineveh" (cf. Zimmern, *K.A.T.*, S. 379), and the king lauds his own reign as an epoch of great fruitfulness (*K.B.* ii. 157). "During my reign abundance came down plenteously, during my lifetime descended rich blessing," concludes a detailed description of ideal harvests and fecund herds. Yet here we need only perceive the thought of a period of rich material blessing being bestowed upon the monarch as favourite of the Gods. But in Egypt, where the divinity of the king is an ancient tenet, the two streams of thought, that of a new age and that of a divine Saviour-ruler who brings the new age, are closely united.[1] The Aion-worship found therefore in Alexandria, in the early Ptolemy period, soil that had for centuries been prepared to receive it. A period of misfortune, and the dominion of evil succeeded by a time of order, law, and joy brought by the king-redeemer, is the general scheme of Egyptian prophetic texts.[2]

---

[1] Baumgarten, *ut sup.*, p. 23: "Aber ebenso klar ist . . . dass er (Daniel) nicht von sich aus darauf gekommen ist, Israel als einen vom Himmel kommenden Menschen darzustellen. Es muss eine durch die Tradition gegebene Gestalt sein, die er dann erst in diesem Sinne umdeutet." The *απ᾽ ἠελίοιο* of Sib. iii. 652 ("King from the Sun," who brings a new age), if either Lietzmann's view of this phrase (*Weltheiland*, pp. 25, 53 f.—Egyptian influence; cf. Bousset, *R. d. J.*, p. 486, cf. p. 226) or Norden's (*G. d. K.*, p. 146—Chaldean astral influence; cf. Sib. iii. ver. 809) be accepted, can no longer be regarded as of merely geographical content (Charles, *ad loc.*, "from the sunrise," "from the east"; Kautzsch, "von Sonnenaufgang her").

[2] H. Lietzmann, *Der Weltheiland*, p. 20 f.: "Aber es scheint, als ob diese Züge in späterer Zeit, etwa nach 2000, stärker zurücktreten, wenn nicht streckenweise gänzlich verschwinden"; p. 22: "Aber mehr als die Möglichkeit dieser Auffassung (*i.e.* of a Saviour-King in time of Assurbanipal) wird nach dem vorgetragenem Befunde ein kritisch gestimmter Historiker einstweilen nicht zugestehen können."

Now it was from this Oriental belief in the deified king and from the Greek veneration of heroes that the belief in the saving and redeeming power of the monarch, his divine character, his mission to bring peace and order, had grown and had established itself in the kingdoms of the Ptolemies and Seleucids (cf. Bousset, *Rel. d. Jud.*, p. 225). In these two territories, Syria of the Seleucids and the Egypt of the Ptolemies, Lietzmann states, "we can observe how the originally Greek conception of *Soter* immediately joins with the Oriental idea of divine king and ultimately effects that hoping for a Saviour which dominates the Roman period."[3] It is thus in this religious and historical context, where the current of the propagating idea of King-Soter is strong and powerful, that we must view the period of Antiochus Epiphanes and his predecessors.

---

[1] Cf. Lietzmann, *ibid.*, p. 26; Norden, *G. d. Kindes*, p. 53: "In Ägypten sind Verkündigungen auf einen gottgesandten König, der die Urzeit wiederbringen wird, so alt, dass dem gegenüber auch das sonst Älteste fast jung erscheint." Cf. Gressmann, *Texte und Bilder*, p. 204 f.

[2] Meyer, *Sitz. Ber. Berl. Ak.*, 1905, S. 651 f. Norden, *ut sup.*, p. 53.

[3] *Weltheiland*, p. 12: "Auf diesen beiden Gebieten können wir beobachten, wie die ursprüngliche griechische Heilandsvorstellung sofort eine Verschmelzung mit der orientalischen Gottkönigsidee eingeht und so den Heilandsgedanken erzeugt, welcher die römische Zeit beherrscht."

The history of the spread in the Roman Empire of both the Aion-concept and the ruler-cult may be regarded as illuminative of their former history. In the *Fourth Eclogue*, where Vergil's "*Saturnus: Apollo*" is but a translation of the "Kronos-Helios" of the source upon which he draws, Apollo's reign is the rule of the Saviour destined to bring a new world-epoch. Apollo, as manifestation of Helios, is the divine representative of the new age. It is significant for the persistence of this tradition that, after the Aion-concept had come in the first century B.C. to Rome and Aion had been identified with Janus, we have later the explanation of Nigidius (Macrob. *Sat.* i. 9. 5–8) that Janus is Apollo and his counterpart, Diana (Artemis).[1] The rendering of *Aion* in the Roman world by *Janus* shows clearly, according to Reitzenstein, that in the early Hellenistic age Aion was regarded as door-keeper, as θυραῖος.[2] But this is the function and title of Apollo. There thus emerges the fact of the close union between the Aion-concept and Apollo "of the Entrance."

From the connexion of the Apollo-cult on the one hand with the Chaldean-Iranian Aion-concept, and on the other with the ruler-cult borne from the Orient to Rome, must be explained the impulse given to the cult of Apollo in the Empire by Augustus, who elevates the worship of this deity, for whom he had built a splendid temple on the Palatine hill, to a prominent position as religion of the State. The legend grew that he was a son of Apollo (Suet. *Aug.* 94), and we hear of a statue of the Emperor with the insignia of the God (Serv. *Ecl.* iv. 10). But Augustus himself showed reserve in the acceptance of divine honours. The ruler-cult here is as yet in but tentative beginning (cf. Horace, *Odes*, iii. 5). The salutations from the provinces are, however, as can be expected, more confident. The decree of the cities of Asia Minor (9 B.C.)[1] which hails the Emperor as divine and as Saviour who "will end all strife and restore the whole world-order," and signalizes his birthday as "the beginning of the world's history" (*ἀρχὴ τῶν πάντων*), permits us to perceive the stimulation of the ruler-cult in Rome through Oriental ideas of the new age.[2] On Roman soil, soon after its appearance in the first century B.C., the Aion-concept seems to have first joined with a belief in *Roma æterna* (the Imperium), and apparently only after this union had been made did it unite with the Cæsar-cult.[3] But in the kingdom of the Seleucids the union of Aion-concept and ruler-cult, which we may regard as solidly effected, would supply a twofold reason for honours paid to Apollo as divine representative of the new age and as patron-deity of the Seleucid House.

---

[1] Cf. Reitzenstein, *I.E.M.*, p. 213: "Janum eundem esse atque Apollinem et Dianam et in hoc uno utrumque exprimi numen."

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 238: "Wir sahen, dass schon im ersten Jahrhundert v. Chr. die Aionlehre auf Janus übertragen wurde, und es ist wohl klar, dass dies nur geschehen konnte, wenn der Aion schon in frühhellenistischer Zeit in Alexandria auch als der Türhüter galt." Cf. pp. 213 and xii (note) *re* Janus as Thuraios.

II

We must now ask whether the *name* of the Jewish festival itself may not have had a significance beyond that of the institution of the altar (1 M. iv. 51–54, 59) and of initiating the temple (2 M. x. 5) to its service. Kittel believes that the title "Hanukkah," which denotes new beginning (*Neubeginn*), retains connexion with the proper name Hanok (Enoch), and thus had in itself solar significance. He bases on the view (cf. Gunkel, *Genesis*, 3rd ed. p. 135 f.; Jeremias, *A.T. im Lichte des alten Orients*, 3rd ed. p. 109) that the legend (Gen. v. 23) of Enoch living 365 years, his age corresponding to the days of the sun's annual journey, and his being translated to the heavens, points to Enoch as representing a year-God, a God of the new year or turn of the year, such as Janus was.[1] Now while in the institution of the cultus by Judas, acting, as 2 M. doubtless rightly reports, on the models supplied by Israel's past, we have a single and historical act amply sufficing to account for the name of the festival, the Enoch literature, which extends from pre-Maccabean times onwards (Charles, *Pseudep.*, 1 Enoch), is proof that the name of Enoch was the very lively medium of popular religion, saga, and astrological lore. Should the name have had, as has been surmised, solar character in current thought, we might be able to trace this here and bring it into relationship with the name and nature of Hanukkah. The Genesis tradition of Enoch shows Babylonian influence,[2] but what Bousset says of the likewise so affected pseudepigraphic narratives of Enoch (*Rel. d. Jud.*, p. 491), Enoch's wonderful journeys, his appearing before the throne of God, his preaching to the angels, his being the discoverer of all hidden wisdom, in particular of astronomy—that all this is not evolved or spun out of Gen. v. 21–24, may be taken as direction that if the title Hanukkah itself had solar significance accruing to it from the person of Enoch, we must base evidence for this on a broader foundation than the data in Genesis, that is, on conceptions we find in being relatively near the time of our festival's appearance in Jewish guise.

---

[1] Priene Inscr. Cf. Harnack, *Reden und Aufsätze*, Bd. i. 2nd ed. 1906, p. 301; Lietzmann, *ut sup.*, p. 14 f.

[2] Cf. Harnack, *ibid.*, p. 304: "(Hier hatte) die religiöse Sprache eine Kraft gewonnen, die sie zum Ausdruck einer geistigen Weltreligion fähig (machte). Aber alles dies war angeschlossen an den Kaiserkultus."

[3] Cf. Reitzenstein, *ut sup.*, pp. 210, 220, 222, 225.

---

[1] Kittel, *Die hellenistische Mysterienreligion und das Alte Testament*, p. 19: "Aber sein (Chanukka) Zusammenhang mit dem Eigennamen Chanok Henoch lässt eine weitere Deutung zu." "Man hatte daher immer wieder daran gedacht, dass die 365 Jahre seiner Lebenszeit genau den Tagen eines Sonnenjahres entsprechen und dass deshalb sein Name irgendwie mit einem Jahrgott, einem Vertreter des Jahrwechsels und Neujahrs wie Janus in Zusammenhang zu bringen sei."

[2] *Re* Enoch and the Enmeduranki (Euedorachos) of the Berossus' list of antediluvian kings, cf. Jeremias, *ut sup.*, p. 104 f. (Die biblischen Urväter); Bousset, *ut sup.*, p. 490 f.

In the Enoch-literature two characteristics of Enoch stand out. He is the revealer of knowledge of the heavenly luminaries (Charles, 1 *Enoch*, 72–82, before 110 B.C.). "He was with the angels of God these six Jubilees of years, and they showed him everything which is on earth and in the heavens, the rule of the sun, and he wrote down everything" (Jub. iv. 21). He made known to men "the days of the years and set in order the months, and recounted the Sabbaths of the years" (Jub. iv. 18; cf. ver. 17). This portraiture of Enoch, harking back, we may suppose, to ancient folklore, stories of his having walked with God, of his being the recipient of divine knowledge, and thereafter translated to the heavens, is nevertheless drawn in accord with a strict monotheism. It is to be viewed as part of the answer which the Palestinian Jews in the second century B.C. were obliged to make, in defensive apologetic interest, to the Chaldean wisdom. Enoch accordingly arises as the inventor of astronomy who has surveyed the heavens, and at length we have the statement made that he was the instructor of the Chaldeans themselves in this science (Eupolemus in Euseb. *Præp. Ev.* ix. 17; Bousset, p. 74). The Alexandrian Jews adopt the same method against

Hellenism, and seek to show that Hellenic wisdom was contained in their Scriptures. But the earlier apologetic task had envisaged the Chaldean-astral religion. Chaldean influence is thus perceived to have been continuously operative. That Enoch was chosen as Jewish astronomer is, however, entirely explicable from the Biblical tradition of his intercourse with the God of the heavens, and his dwelling with Him. And even if we concede that the number of Enoch's years point to his original solar character, or that he was originally a God (" vielleicht . . . eine alte Göttergestalt "—Schwally, *Leben nach dem Tode*, p. 119), the connexion between Hanukkah, the festival of 164 B.C., and Hanok might be no stronger than that which exists between the word " inaugurate " as used by us to-day and the ancient " Augur," the prognosticator of events from the flight of birds.

But a second characteristic of the Enoch of the Enoch-literature, that of his being " the writer " (1 Enoch xii. 3) is fundamental, has relation to his being astronomer-recorder (Jub. iv. 21), and has bearing upon the question of his representing a God, or of his having such quality as might impress significance upon the term " Hanukkah." He is " writer of righteousness " (1 Enoch xii. 4, xv. 1), and may appear to be no other than the heavenly writer, the angel-recorder of the deeds of the shepherds (lxxxix. 70 f.). Translated to Paradise, " he writes down the condemnation and judgment of the world " (Jub. iv. 23), and accounts " all the deeds of the generations " until the judgment (ver. 24). Bousset (*Rel. d. Jud.*, p. 353 f.), following the course of this evidently old tradition farther, quotes the statement of Ps.-Jonathan on Gen. v. 24, that after translation to heaven Enoch was called Metatron, " the great writer." He shows that in

Rabbinic literature Metatron takes up this rôle of Enoch, and concludes that "the derivation of this figure (Enoch-Metatron) depends on the opinion formed of the origin of the Son of Man and the Ancient of Days; for the 'writer' is naturally inseparable from the 'Books of Judgment' of the highest tribunal of Dan. vii."[1] If, then, we revert to the vision of Dan. vii., or rather to the prototype of it as represented by the poem of Claudianus, and the description in the latter of the Ancient One who is writing eternal laws (*mansura verendus scribit iura senex*), and of Sol who, in the original tradition, according to Gressmann (*ut sup.*), received the kingdom of the End-time (*der endzeitliche Messias*), we might regard these conceptions as having contributed to the character of Enoch.

The functions of Kronos-Zarvan we may conceive were, in popular Chaldean tradition, executed with the help of an intermediate personality (*e.g.* Nabu) as writer. The Ancient One of Claudianus' poem himself is writer, and prescribes the courses of the stars (*numeros qui dividit astris et cursus*, etc.). In Daniel's vision, where the Ancient of Days sits in judgment, "books were opened," but it is not said by whom. It is possible that in the Jewish tradition, Enoch, the companion of God, was given this duty of keeper of the books, and that thus he became the recorder and the revealer and originator of astronomic wisdom. If, further, the text of 1 Enoch lxxi. 14–17 be not in need of emendation (see Charles, *Pseudep.*, *in loc.*), it would seem that also a step in a different direction was taken, and that Enoch and the Son of Man merged and became identical.[1] On the supposition that Enoch originally had solar character, it would then have to be admitted that this was a possible cause of the equation.[2] But while Enoch may not be separable from the Persons in the heavenly scene of Dan. vii., which 1 Enoch itself describes (xlvi. 1 f., xlvii. 3 f., xlviii. 2; cf. lv. 1, lx. 2, lxxi. 10 f.), and which has its background in Chaldean-Iranian astral thought, it is more likely that he rose into prominence merely as a Jewish equivalent of the Babylonian Scribe-God, Nabu, to whose office Gunkel ascribes the title given later to Ezra (4 Ezra xiv. 50), "Scribe of the knowledge of the Most High."[3] On the other hand, the legend of his being the associate of God (Gen. v. 22, יתהלך) is sufficient to have led to his being elevated to the position of the Son of Man, who (1 Enoch xlvi. 2) "went with" the Head of Days. In drawing conclusions for the period in which Kittel supposes Enoch represented a year-God, we may not stress that in 1 Enoch xv. 2 the very point of the narrative, which may be an early tradition, namely, Enoch's intercession for the fallen angels, is Enoch's humanity, and that in the Parables (105–64 B.C.; cf. xlviii. 3, 6, xlvi. 1 f., xlix. 2), where the Son of Man is described as pre-existent, Enoch, the beholder of the celestial scene, has to have all explained to him by an angel. When, however, we examine the higher reaches of the stream of Babylonian influence, as represented by the Genesis account of Enoch, and the lower reaches of the same stream which flows in the Enoch narratives, a continuous tradition of the character of Enoch seems to be preserved. The counterpart of the Enoch of Genesis, the Enmeduranki of Berossus' list, is called "into the communion of the Gods"; he is a king and founder of the Barû-priesthood, who, in virtue of their knowledge of the science of reading omens from the entrails of animals, were custodians of "the mystery of heaven and earth." He himself is the "keeper of the mystery of heaven and earth," bearer of divine revelation, and he who "had the written tablets of the mystery of heaven and earth."[1] The Enoch of Jewish literature is essentially of the same type—a man, a revealer of the divine mysteries, writer, keeper of the heavenly books, possessor of the science of the heavens and the earth. Both Enmeduranki and Enoch may have solar connexion, but they have not therefore themselves solar character. Both keep well within the framework of the *Translation-myth* (the translation of mortals), against the turning of which, in the department of Greek mythology, into solar myths Rhode (*Psyche*, Eng. tr., p. 83, note 18) makes very strong protest. Moreover, if the Enoch tradition or name had possessed any potentiality of attaching itself, on account of his supposed solar character, to a particular month in the year, it would seem that we could not pass over

---

[1] *Loc. cit.*: "Die Herkunft dieser Gestalt wird davon abhängen, wie man über den Ursprung des Menschensohnes und des Hochbetagten denkt; denn der 'Schreiber' ist natürlich von den 'Gerichtsbüchern' des höchsten Gerichtshofes (Da. 7) nicht zu trennen" (*Rel. d. Jud.*, 3rd ed. p. 354).

---

[1] Beer (in Kautzsch, *Pseudep.*, Bd. ii. 1921, p. 228): "Mit Kap. 70 und 71 beginnt eine sebstständige Tradition. Henoch, der in den Bilderreden durchaus von dem Menschensohn unterschieden ist, wird Kap. 71 geradezu mit ihm identifiziert. Inhaltlich sind sonst Kap. 70 und 71 nicht unabhängig von Kap. 37 ff. mit denen sie auch den Gebrauch des Namens 'Menschensohn' für den Messias gemein haben." Cf. also p. 277 (note to 71. 14): "Henoch wird hier geradezu zu einer Inkarnation des Menschensohns-Messias (Baldensperger, *Selbstbew. Jesu*, 2nd ed. S. 13 f.)." Cf. 2 Enoch xxii. 8, lvi. 2, lxiv. 5. So also Bousset (*Rel. d. Jud.*, 3rd ed. p. 353), who compares 2 Enoch xxii. 6, lxvii. 2.

[2] Cf. Gunkel (in Kautzsch, *Pseudep.*, p. 397, note to 4 Ezra xiii. 51) on the Man (Messiah) who rises from the heart of the sea: "Wenn der Stoff mythologischer Art ist, so liegt der Gedanke an einen Gestirngott nahe, der aus dem Meere auftaucht, zum Himmelsberg emporsteigt, seine Feinde mit seinen glühenden Strahlen verbrennt und dann sein Friedensreich stiftet."

[3] Gunkel, *ut sup.*, p. 348. Cf. 2 Enoch xxiii. 4–6, ref. to *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, 1898, p. 299: "Der Schreiberengel Nabu im A.T. und im Judentum." Cf. Jeremias, *Das A.T. im Lichte, usw.*, p. 625, who in Ezek. ix. 2 (the "man with a writer's inkhorn") sees a representation of Nabu.

[1] Jeremias, *ut sup.*, pp. 68, 105 (note 6), 109.

the statement of 2 Enoch lxviii. 3 (cf. ver. 1): "And he (Enoch) was again taken up to heaven on the sixth day of the month Tsivan, on the very day and hour when he was born," and "they made a great feast, rejoicing and making merry three days" (ver. 7).

We must therefore conclude that the restoration of the temple-worship, which in the Jewish conception of a new age was first act in a divine drama (with older prophecies, Ezek. xl.–xliv; Isa. liv. 11; Hag. ii. 7–9; Zech. i. 16; cf. Sir. xxxvi. 18 f.; Tob. xiii. 15–16; 1 Enoch xci. 13; Jub. i. 17, 27), gave the name Hanukkah to the festival, and that this name did not extend to an interpretation of the God to which the original feast had reference. Not Hanok was the Jewish Janus who represented the heathen God of the year's "Neubeginn," but Jahveh Hypsistos, the Head of Days. But though to Enoch's name we cannot give the significance which Kittel conjectures, in the 1 Enoch writings, the function and person of Enoch, the place given to Daniel's vision of the Head of Days, and the development of the Aion-teaching (xviii. 16, xxi. 6) are themselves proof of the undiminished influence of Babylonian-Iranian religion.

III

It remains to consider the two interpretations of the lamp of Hanukkah which have appeared to us to be justified and to be in accord with the ideas of the cult which the lamp suppressed. Lamps at the door where the *'Αγυιεὺς βωμός* had stood and had received offerings, in private and domestic interest, on sacred days, on the king's birthdays, and in particular on the days of the Helios festival, were now lit (על פתח בית מבחוץ) at Hanukkah. These "lights," as substitute for the burnings at the doors, retained, we have concluded, the "inner" or religious significance which the Hellenistic festival of Kronos-Helios had. But new-age thoughts are apt to break upon the reef of realities. The Hasmonean dynasty raised, after but one generation had passed, the open hostility of the Pharisees. The ideas behind the ritual of the lamp had little chance of maintaining vigour in the atmosphere of intense bitterness and hatred which the dominant Pharisaic party harboured against the family who had been the founders of the new Jewish state. This change of spirit and circumstances, without doubt, accounts for the beginning of the process which we see in 2 M., of explaining the light-symbol by details and incidents connected with the temple-cultus. Also the disastrous course of Jewish history was unfavourable for the preservation of the tradition of the Jewish Aion-festival. The hesitating explanation of "Lights" by Josephus may be judged from this standpoint; the "hieros logos" of the lamp, if it did not escape him, is glossed over by him. Both interpretations of the lamp, as lamp of the new sovereignty and light of the Law, combine in the conception of Hanukkah as Aion-festival. In the Priestly Code, where already the scheme of division of history into four world-periods appears, as we find it in Dan. ii. (cf. viii. 22; Zech. ii. 1; 1 Enoch lxxxix. 68 f.), each new period is distinguished by a divine revelation, a new covenant, and ordinances.[1]

---

[1] Cf. Gunkel, "Die Urgeschichte und die Patriarchen" (*Das erste Buch Mosis. Schr. d. A.T.*, 1911), pp. 48, 183; p. 125: "Nach der Theorie des P. ist jedes neue Weltalter mit einer besonderen Offenbarung und Bundschliessung Gottes eingeleitet worden." Cf. Bousset, *R. d. J.*, p. 504: "Wenn in der Tiervision des Henochbuches von 70 (72) Hirten die Rede ist, welche Israel weiden sollen und die 70 Hirten offenbar 70 Zeitperioden der Not entsprechen, so steht die Meinung im Hintergrund, dass den einzelnen Zeitepochen bestimmte Weltregenten, Engel (Gestirne) entsprechen, die über den betreffenden Zeitabschnit

In the last two periods, those begun by Abraham and Moses, the new age is given the *imprimatur* of the divine sovereignty by a special name of the deity being attached to it (El-Shaddai; Jahveh). Here the concepts, new world-period, new or renewed rule, new ordinances or covenant, present themselves.

According to the scheme of P, the last period from Moses onwards stood under the dispensation of the Law revealed to him. It might therefore seem that in the period in which Hanukkah arose, the idea of the Law as Jahveh's final word to Moses did not permit of further application of this conception of P to a new age beginning with the overthrow of the Syrian tyranny. But in the thought concerning *Wisdom* we perceive a mystic theology appearing in Judaism, and attaching itself to the *Law*. Further, that there was a connexion in idea between the figure of Wisdom and the Aion-concept may be concluded from their later history. In Egypt, where Aion had been deified, Wisdom, *Σοφία*, actually becomes the Aion himself (or herself),[1] or the Wisdom of God is said to be the Aion in conjunction with other virtues.[2] Tracing the influence of the Aion-teaching, Reitzenstein cites 1 Cor. ii. 6 f., where St. Paul contrasts the wisdom of this Aion (*σοφίαν . . . τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου*), and of its rulers who shall come to nought, with the hidden wisdom of God which He foreordained before the Aions (*πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων*) unto

---

herrschen"; p. 205: "Diese ganze Theorie (ein neues Weltalter, ein neuer Gott, ein neuer Herrscher) hat auch in die griechische, römische Kulturwelt mächtig hineingewirkt."

[1] *ὁ κύριος ἐπεμαρτύρησέ σου τῇ σοφίᾳ, ὁ ἐστιν Αἰών κ.τ.λ.* (*Wessely Denkschr.*, 1888, S. 74, Z. 1205). Cf. Reitzenstein, *I.E.R.*, p. 174; Lackeit, *Aion, Zeit, und Ewigkeit*, p. 79, note 1: "Isis Σοφία wird als weiblicher *αἰών* verehrt"; "Der Aion ist ja mannweiblich . . . dabei als persönliche Gottheit gefasst" (*I.E.R.*, *ib.*).

[2] *Corp. Herm.* xi. 3. Cf. Lackeit (*ut sup.*, *ib.*), *I.E.R.* (*ut sup.*, *ib.* Anm. 3): *ἡ δὲ θεοῦ σοφία τί(s) ἐστιν; τὸ ἀγαθὸν καὶ τὸ καλὸν καὶ ἡ εὐδαιμονία καὶ ἡ πᾶσα ἀρετὴ καὶ ὁ αἰών.*

our glory. Reitzenstein observes that what gave point to St. Paul's words as understood by the people he addressed, was the conjunction of the two terms *Σοφία* and *Αἰών* in current mystic thought.[1] In Gal. iii. 19 f., where the thought is parallel to 1 Cor. ii. 6 f., though neither of the expressions Wisdom or Aion occurs in the former passage, the argument is that the Law, by which sin came into the world, was valid only for the former age, and as a means of training for the new Aion in Christ. By St. Paul's time the connexion of Wisdom (Law) and Aion had become a commonplace of mystic religious belief.

Among the results of the spread of the Aion-concept in the West was the rise of the belief in the ever-enduring sovereignty of Rome, the city and the Empire (*æternitas imperii*), and finally even of the Emperor himself as representative of the Empire. It would not seem to be a further stage of development, but only a more thorough application of prevalent ideas, when Constantine, in transferring the "æternitas" conception to his new capital, has the great Basilica dedicated to *Ἁγία Σοφία*. Here Wisdom, Reitzenstein remarks, "is herself the Aion or the companion of the Aion; her seat was to be the new city."[2] But already in Sirach (xxiv. 1–34), though the doctrine of Jerusalem as an eternal city, with her counterpart in heaven, may not have as yet emerged (cf. Charles, *Apoc.* xxiv. 11;

---

[1] *I.E.R.*, p. 236: "Die in der Mystik übliche Verbindung von Σοφία und Αἰών gibt dem Ausdruck die Pointe." Cf. Eph. iii. 9 f.

[2] *I.E.R.*, p. 229, Anm. 1: "Sie ist selbst der Aion oder die Genossin des Aions; ihr Sitz soll die neue Stadt sein." Cf. p. 207 f. Cf. p. 229: "Schon 323 nach dem Sieg und der Wiedervereinigung des Reiches hat er die Münze geprägt, die ihn den Zodiakus in der Hand haltend darstellt mit der Umschrift 'rector totius orbis.' Es kann, wenn wir die Aion-Darstellungen in der Apotheose des Antoninus und auf der Münze Hadrians vergleichen, nicht zweifelhaft sein, dass er hier schon bei Lebzeiten als der reichserhaltende Aion erscheinen will."

I.E.R., p. 209), Wisdom, who is πρὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος ἀπ' ἀρχῆς (ver. 9), descends, to make her abode the Holy City. (" In the Holy City likewise he caused me to rest, and in Jerusalem was my authority—ἡ ἐξουσία μοῦ," ver. 11.) Eternal Wisdom-Law is here the representative of Jahveh's sovereignty.

Half a millennium after the institution of the festival of Hanukkah, Constantine's new city became the seat of his eternal imperium and of Hagia Sophia. The Aion-concept which in A.D. 326 thus found symbol in his new foundation, as it had already upon his coins, was by no means at the end of its progression.[1] Neither in Judaism in the year 164 B.C. was it in its first beginnings. That Daniel can combat his nation's foes, and strengthen the resistance of his own people against religious and political aggression, with thought that displays the influence of Iranian doctrine interwoven with elements of Babylonian astral religion, is proof that among the people themselves, the conceptions he employs had for long been widely spread. The older national hopes had undergone under that influence a change, and the expected future is now of a universal and cosmic character—a new world order. In Daniel the concept " æternitas imperii " is fully developed. In the new Aion which is immediately to dawn, and in which " the people of the saints of the Most High " (vii. 27) will bear rule, " an everlasting kingdom " (שלטן עלם) will be set up. The description in 1 Enoch xc. 20–42, perhaps written while Judas is still warring, of a new Jerusalem which will take the place of the old, of the throne of God erected in the pleasant land (Palestine, Jerusalem; cf. Charles, *Pseudep.*), and of all nations obeying the people of God, is also implicitly that of an eternal kingdom. Both the conception of the eternal kingdom on earth, and that of Sophia, eternal Law, presiding in Zion (Sir. xxiv. 10), exercising authority in the capital, had therefore received expression before the Jewish festival was instituted.

---

[1] Lackeit (*ut sup.*), p. 86 : " Im 5 und 6 nachchristlichen Jahrhundert treten die Personifikationen des αἰὼν in verhältnismässig grosser Fülle zutage . . . sie knüpfen sich an die Gestalt des Dichters Nonnos von Panoplis." Lackeit stresses, to account for this activity, " the unlimited imagination " (unbegrenzte Phantasie) of Nonnos, but unjustly, according to Reitzenstein (*I.E.R.*, p. 187, note 2, p. 246).

The two central features of Jewish religion, the Law, through the equation with Wisdom, and the eschatology, which had received a new inspiration and content through Iranian Aion-teaching, had reached a high point in the history of their development in the period in which Hanukkah arose. Though the ritual of the lamp was based upon the rites which it dethroned, the lamp as a symbol of Law, we have sought to show, is not to be explained from a general metaphor but from that theology of light which penetrated into Judaism with the doctrine of a future life, and which had particular connexion with the concept of the "daēna" who attaches herself, as we discover Wisdom-Law attached herself, to the soul of man at birth. On the other hand, Revelation, Covenant, Law, were united by the speculation regarding world-epochs with the idea of rule or sovereignty in the new age. That Sophia becomes in Egypt the very Aion shows how intimate this union was. In the ancient expression "lamp of Israel," which acquired Messianic character, we see, within Judaism, a conception itself capable of application to the sovereignty of Jahveh or of the people of the Most High, in that era which was felt to be the opening of a new chapter of history. As the Apollo altars had been the emblem of the rule of the Seleucid monarchs, we may assume that the lamps that were lit at the festival were regarded as Hasmonean lamps, and that the term " lamp of David " acquired therefrom additional significance when the Maccabees came to be described in pharisaic language as usurpers (*Thronräuber*—Bousset, p. 223). But from the beginning, when the lamp was instituted, we may not suppose that sharp distinction between the divine and the earthly government was made. In Enoch xc. 37 the Messiah is not an angelic but a human figure (see Charles, *Pseudep.*, vol. ii. p. 260), emerging from the community of Israel itself. Indeed, in those Apocalypses where eschatological thought is most intense, where the world-judgment is most powerfully drawn, the figure of a Davidic king-Messiah is absent (cf. Bousset, pp. 223, 259). The establishment of the theocracy, which inspired the Hasidim and the like-minded writer of the dream-visions (1 Enoch lxxxiii.–xc.), " was bound up with the success of the Maccabean leader " (Charles, Bd. ii. p. 257), and if the hope of a future Messiah is faint, or almost non-existent, this was due to the Maccabees themselves being regarded as " Messianic," as the bearers of the sovereignty of God in the new Aion.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX I

The *Mishnah* references to Hanukkah are in respect of:

Fasts, Mourning:

1. Taʿan. ii. 10: "A public fast is not decreed on Newmoons, Hanukkah, and Purim, but if it has begun (and one of the three named seasons should intervene) it is not (on that account) terminated. Thus Rabban Gamaliel." אין גוזרין תענית על הצבור בראשי חדשים בחנוכה ובפורים ואם התחילו אין מפסיקין דברי רבן גמליאל.

2. Moed Katan iii. 9: "On Newmoons, Hanukkah, and Purim, responses are made and the hands clapped, but there is no lamentation." בראשי חדשים בחנכה ובפורים מענות ומטפחות בזה ובזה אבל לא מקוננות. Cf. Meg. Taʿan. ix.: "On the 25th (of Kislev) is the festival of Hanukkah, eight days, on which no mourning." בעשרין וחמשה ביה יום חנכת תמנית יומין די לא למספד.

Seasonal Significance:

3. Bikkurim i. 6: "From Pentecost to festival of Booths one may bring (the offering of first-fruits) and make the recitation (of Deut. xxvi. 5 f.). From Booths to Hanukkah one may bring but not make the recitation. Rabbi Jehudah ben Betherah says, one may bring and recite." [The Halakah is against Jehudah. Of the time after Hanukkah there is no mention, for now no fruits ripen; and it is not permissible to bring them because it is written (Deut. xxvi. 2): אשר תביא מארצך, "which thou shalt bring of thy land." See *Mischnah-traktat Bikkurim*, Dr. Karl Albrecht, and notes of Maimonides and

Bartenora in *Mish. Surenh., ad loc.*] מעצרת ועד החג מביא וקורא מן החג ועד חנוכה מביא ואינו קירא רבי יהודה בן בתירה אומר מביא וקורא.

4. Rosh-hash. i. 3: "In regard to six months, messengers are sent forth, (namely) Nisan because of Passover, Ab because of the fast, Elul because of New Year, Tishri because of the order of the festivals, Kislev because of Hanukkah (על כסליו מפני חנוכה), and Adar because of Purim, and when the Sanctuary stood they went out on account of Iyyar because of the Small-Passover." [The beginning of each month was fixed by the Council at Jerusalem, and intimation of the first day of the six important months was given to the Jewish communities outside Jerusalem so that the festivals would not be held on the wrong dates.]

A Case in Civil Law which might arise from the Custom and Position of the Hanukkah-lamp:

5. Baba kamma vi. 6. See Chapter V. p. 134 f. above.

The Lectionary for Hanukkah:

6. Megillah iii. 4: "On the fifth Sabbath (*i.e.* the Sabbath after the fourth Sabbath of Adar) return is made to the regular order (of Scripture-reading from the Prophets, the Haphtarahs), but in each case, on Newmoons, on Hanukkah and Purim, on fasts, on the Maʿamādoth, and on the Day of Atonement, interruption (of the ordinary sequence of Haphtarah-readings) takes place (and the special Haphtarah-portion is read)." בחמישית חוזרין לכסדרן לכל מפסיקין בראשי חדשין בחנוכה ובפורים בתעניות ובמעמדות וביום הכיפורים.

7. Megillah iii. 6: "On Hanukkah (there is read the passage concerning) 'the Princes' (*i.e.* Num. vii.)." בחנוכה בנשיאים.

APPENDIX II

Claudianus, *De Consulatu Stilichonis*, Liber ii. line 422 f.

Sol ipse quadrigis
vere coronatis dignum tibi præparat annum.
Est ignota procul nostræque impervia menti,
vix adeunda deis, annorum squalida mater,
immensi spelunca ævi, quæ tempora vasto
suppeditat revocatque sinu; complectitur antrum,
omnia qui placido consumit numine, serpens
perpetuumque viret squamis caudamque reductam
ore vorat tacito relegens exordia lapsu.
Vestibuli custos vultu longæva decoro
ante fores Natura sedet, cunctisque volantes
dependent membris animæ. Mansura verendus
scribit iura senex, numeros qui dividit astris
et cursus stabilesque moras, quibus omnia vivunt
ac pereunt fixis cum legibus. Ille recenset,
incertum quid Martis iter certumque Tonantis
prospiciat mundo; quid velox semita Lunæ
pigraque Saturni; quantum Cytherea sereno
curriculo Phœbique comes Cyllenius erret.
Illius ut magno Sol limine constitit antri,
occurrit Natura potens seniorque superbis
canitiem inclinat radiis. Tum sponte reclusus
laxavit postes adamas, penetrale profundum
panditur et sedes ævique arcana patescunt.
Hic habitant vario facies distincta metallo

sæcula certa locis: illic glomerantur æna,
hic ferrata rigent, illic argentea candent.
Eximia regione domus, contingere terris
difficilis, rutili stabat grex aureus anni: 450
quorum præcipuum pretioso corpore Titan
signandum Stilichone legit; tunc imperat omnes
pone sequi dictisque simul compellat euntes:
"En, cui distulimus melioris sæcla metalli,
consul adest. Ite optati mortalibus anni,
ducite virtutes; hominum florescite rursus
ingeniis hilares Baccho frugumque feraces.
Non inter geminos Anguis glaciale Triones
sibilet, inmodico nec frigore sæviat Ursa.
Non toto fremat ore Leo, nec brachia Cancri 460
urat atrox æstas, mandidæ nec prodigus urnæ
semina prærupto dissolvat Aquarius imbre.
Phrixeus roseo producat fertile cornu
ver Aries, pingues nec grandine tundat olivas
Scorpius; autumni maturet germina Virgo,
lenior et gravidis adlatret Sirius uvis."
Sic fatus croceis rorantes ignibus hortos
ingreditur vallemque suam, quam flammeus ambit
rivus et inriguis largum iubar ingerit herbis,
quas Sol pascuntur equi; flagrantibus inde 470
cæsariem sertis et lutea lora iubasque
subligat alipedum. Gelidas hinc Lucifer ornat,
hinc Aurora comas iuxtaque adludit habenis
aureus et nomen prætendit consulis Annus;
inque novos iterum revoluto cardine cursus
scribunt ætheriis Stilichonem sidera fastis.

See *Claudian with an English Translation*, by Maurice Platnauer (London: Heinemann, 1922). Claudius Claudianus, born *circa* A.D. 370, and described by Platnauer as the last poet of classical Rome, was,

there can be little doubt, of Egyptian origin. Stilicho's consulship was in A.D. 400, and Claudian, it is supposed, served on Stilicho's private staff. Two of Claudianus' poems touch upon Christianity—the "De Salvatore" and "In Jacobum." The latter shows no closer acquaintance with Christianity than a knowledge of the common ejaculations and imprecations of soldiers, and the former, which has had its authenticity doubted (by Heinsius, etc.), is not sufficient to establish his reverence for the Christian religion as being more than "lip-service" (Platnauer, p. xix). Orosius calls Claudian "paganus pervivacissimus" (vii. 35), and Augustine (*Civ. dei*, v. 26) refers to him as "a Christi numine alienus."

APPENDIX III

HANUKKAH AND THE SAMARITANS

DR. BUCHANAN GRAY (*Sacrifice in the Old Testament*, p. 296) observes that if the festival of Hanukkah had its origin in celebrations which were a part of ancient Hebrew life, the questions arise: Why did those celebrations fail to secure a place along with the spring and autumn festivals, Passover and Booths, in the calendar of the Law? and, Why did they fail to leave any trace in the Samaritan liturgy or the Samaritan practice? This latter question, however, he proceeds, could receive a rather different form, and it might be asked: Why, if the Jews Hellenized in accepting a pagan festival, did the Samaritans fail to do so? The absence from Samaritan custom of any celebration corresponding to Hanukkah, and thus of any trace of the Hellenistic Kronos-Helios festival, requires therefore consideration.

It is evident that to account for the absence of some practice among a people, especially when their history is so little known as is that of the Samaritans, whose literature, with the exception of the Pentateuch and a few fragments, is not earlier than the fourth century of our era, is a task of a wholly different kind from the investigation of the origin of rites which are actually present elsewhere in a certain form and at a certain time. Historical records may be very complete, and yet not reveal the reason for the non-appearance of a custom. Nevertheless, certain facts can be adduced which show clearly that the refusal of the Samaritans to accept or to transform the pagan festival of 25th Kislev is consistent with their inability in other respects to accept customs which in Judaism represent a compromise with heathen practice, and that this refusal cannot be regarded as singular, in view of their failure to adopt, till late, beliefs that had infiltrated into Judaism long before.

(*a*) The Samaritans did not adopt the custom of wearing phylacteries and of placing Mezuzoth at the doors. This practice, as we have seen (p. 171 f. above), appears in Judaism most probably in the period 250–100 B.C., a period within which was made the promulgation of the Second Canon, the Prophets, *circa* 200, the rejection of which by the Samaritans witnesses to the widening cleft between the two sects. That the transformation, effected by the Jews, of ancient Hebrew or pagan custom through the institution of Tephillin and Mezuzoth, met with no similar method of defence among the Samaritans, may perhaps be accounted for by the antagonism of these latter to Jewish authority, but not by the supposition that they were not exposed to the same dangers to which those signs on body and on doorpost owed inception. Similarly the absence among the Samaritans of any festival celebration on the 25th Kislev cannot be urged against the view that underlying Hanukkah is a pagan festival which has been reformed.

(*b*) The Passover has been celebrated by the Samaritans up till modern times in a very much more primitive form than by the Jews (see Montgomery, *The Samaritans, the Earliest Jewish Sect, etc.*, p. 37 f.). This statement must only be qualified by mentioning that the Jewish custom of eating the Passover within houses is, so far as this takes place *at home*, a later reversion to the earliest practice (cf. Gray, *l.c.*, p. 371 f.). The Samaritan festival is in the open, on a side of Mount Gerizim; until the Muslims in recent times interposed, the members of the sect applied the blood of the sacrificial victims to their own and their children's faces. After the lambs (from five to seven in number, which are now sufficient for the whole community) have been roasted, they are eaten in haste; the meal is partaken of without wine. In the use of wine by the Jews at this festival, in the articulation of the meal by the means of the cups, in the mingling of the wine with water, in the reclining posture of those present, and in other features, Græco-Roman influence (cf. Beer, *Mischnatraktat Pesachim*) has been perceived. Dr. Gray (*l.c.*, p. 374) holds that, while Hellenistic influence on the Jewish Passover may be exaggerated by Beer, of the reality of this influence "there seems no room for doubt." But even could these features of the meal which have so altered its aspect in Judaism be otherwise explained, the omission of them by the Samaritans from a festival which might normally have undergone modification and gradual change as culture spread, is testimony to a resistance and conservatism which is more difficult to comprehend than their failure to adopt or transform the Hellenistic festival of the 25th of Kislev.

(*c*) J. A. Montgomery (*ut sup.*, p. 205), who concludes that "the greater part of the (Samaritan) theology, as we have it, is the precipitate of the age at or before the beginning of the Christian era," would except from this statement the Samaritan eschatology, which is of later and secondary origin. In Rabbinic literature the creed of the sect is characterized as marked by scrupulous obedience to the Law (Kidd, 76a; Gittin, 10a), by the renunciation of Jerusalem in favour of Gerizim, and by denial of the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead (Kutim, *ad fin.*). The belief in resurrection is first found in the teaching of their great theologian Marka, in the fourth century, about which time it may have been accepted by them as an orthodox tenet, that is, half a millennium after it appears in the Book of Daniel. In Messianic ideas the sect lagged behind Judaism, and these ideas never played "the same capital part as in the other faith" (Montgomery, p. 239; cf. Cowley, "The Samaritan doctrine of the Messiah," *Expositor*, 1895, p. 161). In this, their poverty of apocalyptic thought, we can perceive a reason why the Samaritan community were unable to turn to profit or account the religious conceptions and rites of a festival of the New Age. Important elements of eschatological belief, which in Judaism had borne fruit in the national life in the second century B.C., remain either altogether absent from or appear belated and undeveloped in the Samaritan theology.

(*d*) The attitude of the Samaritans during the Maccabean revolt, their failure to share in the struggle for independence, and the omission from their festival customs of rejoicings on 25th Kislev, may be set in a clearer light by a comparison of Sadducean and Samaritan thought. Sadduceeism was, like Samaritan belief, unprogressive, and in many respects representative of earlier stages of Hebrew belief. But Sadducean rejection of the doctrine of resurrection was intimately connected with political compromise, and indeed has to be explained (cf. Hölscher, *Der Sadduzäismus*, p. 34) by the Sadducean acceptance of foreign government and foreign judicial procedure. For, in Judaism, this doctrine was an integral part of the Messianic hope and carried with it, from the first, political aspirations and revolutionary aims. When the kingdoms of the world were subdued and fallen, then would take place the raising from the dead and the establishing of the kingdom of God upon earth. The Maccabean revolt drew, from this vision, hope and courage in the struggle for liberty. By the belief in a glorious resurrection, the Pharisee teachers inspired their followers to rebel against Herod and to cut down the golden eagle from the great gate of the temple (Jos. *Bell.* i. 33. 2). The further course of Jewish history shows that apocalyptic thought, translated into action, meant national uprising. Now 2 M. vi. 2 reports that under the enforcement of the policy of Antiochus IV. the sanctuary of Gerizim was called after Zeus Xenios, "in keeping with the hospitable character of the inhabitants." We may see, perhaps, a glint of ironical pleasure, on the part of the author, in the thought of Zeus of Hospitality (a title perhaps suggested by the first syllable in Gerizim, *Ger* = stranger; cf. Montgomery, *ut sup.*, p. 77) being the God of the inhabitants of Shechem; but he apparently had in mind not only that this community was subject too to compulsion (2 M. v. 23), as the Jews were, but that it complied without resistance. Josephus' account (*Ant.* xii. 5. 5), full of hatred and contempt for the Samaritans, is that in a letter to the king they denied kinship with the Jews, claimed they were originally Sidonians, and requested Antiochus to let their temple be called the temple of Zeus Hellenios. This letter, the text of which, with the reply of the king granting the petition, is given by Josephus, is without doubt, as Meyer (*Ursprung*, Bd. ii. p. 154 f., note 3) observes, a Jewish forgery. But, comparing the statements of 2 M. and Josephus, it would seem that the sect was compelled, made the best bargain the circumstances admitted, and, politically, maintained correct relations with the Government during Judas' wars. They bowed before the storm, and, when the storm had passed, their faith and customs, so far as the evidence shows, remained unimpaired. Within the sect there was probably no party of zealous Hellenizers such as was within the sister community, where the ancestral religion was attacked from within as well as from without, and where Antiochus' measures were largely a response to the liberal Judaism which had grown up long previously. Within the sect there was also lacking that chief element of Messianic thought which in Judaism inflamed imagination and called forth resistance, martyrdoms, and victory—the doctrine of the resurrection, which later the Sadducees combated not merely for intellectual reasons but on political grounds. The political submission of the Samaritans to the Seleucid ruler, and that of the Sadducees to the Roman power, may differ in degree, kind, and motive, but in the combination of this attitude of both factions with conservatism of religious thought and practice we have an analogous phenomenon. The lateness of the literature perhaps makes Samaritan exclusiveness appear more thorough than in reality it was, but the absence of any festival on 25th Kislev is only one omission among others, in the realm of custom and belief, which show that Samaritan religion in the Hellenistic period did not react to foreign influence as Judaism did. For lack of the great and fruitful religious conceptions which are present in the second century B.C. in Judaism, the Samaritans could not, as the Jews did, take captive for Jahveh Hellenistic practices which had penetrated in the days of "the mingling." The warfare of arms which Judaism waged against the foreign Power, the people who confessed Gerizim declined; for the battle of ideas, as their religious history shows, they were unable.

(*e*) Though the eschatology of the Samaritans, even when in later times it reached fruition, was of a stunted kind, the Messiah being a personality inferior to Moses, there is trace in the first century A.D. of the belief among them that the task of the Messiah at His coming was the replenishing of the sanctuary. The story related by Josephus (*Ant.* xviii. 4. 1) of the Samaritan enthusiast who, shortly before Pilate was recalled to Rome, summoned his people to arms to Mount Gerizim that he might show them the sacred vessels hidden by Moses (!) beneath the holy mountain, appears to indicate that a popular tumult had been raised by some Messianic claimant (cf. Bousset, *Rel. d. Jud.*, p. 224 f.). The narrative must be read in light of a Samaritan hymn (Heidenheim, *Bibliotheca Samaritana*, No. xx.; cf. Montgomery, *ut sup.*, p. 248) which describes the function of the Messiah (Ta'eb) at His advent as being the revealing of the Tabernacle with all its furnishings and the restoring of the cultus with the full ministrations of the priesthood. Along with the mystical idea that the Tabernacle and its accompanying *res sacræ* were meanwhile invisible but exalted above Mount Gerizim, there was also current the conception, found in the teaching of Marka (Heidenheim, *ibid.* iii.; Marka, 77 b; Montgomery, *ibid.*, p. 239), that the Ark is concealed in a cave on Mount Gerizim. It is with this latter form of belief we must connect Josephus' report. It is significant that the Jewish counterpart of the Samaritan legend appears in the proœmium of the Epitomist, who fashioned the work of Jason into a Hanukkah-tractate. He tells (2 M. ii. 4 f.) how Jeremiah had concealed the Tabernacle, Ark, and Altar of incense in a cavern on the mount from which Moses had viewed the promised land, and that these sacred objects were to remain hidden there "until God gather the people together again and mercy come." Both the Jewish and the Samaritan legends demonstrate how essential a part the Hanukkah of the Sanctuary was in the picture of the Messianic age. In Judaism the historical experience which provided for the germs of the legend conditions of growth, can only have been the destruction of the Temple and the new hopes of the returned exiles. How many years prior to A.D. 36, when the Samaritan Messiah raised his standard, the notion that the Messiah's work was to reveal and restore the sacred vessels had been a tenet of Samaritan belief, it is impossible to say. But it may be conjectured that after Hyrkanus (21st Kislev 128 B.C.) destroyed the Samaritan temple on Gerizim and "the day of Gerizim" had become, for the Jews, a day of special rejoicings, a *yōm tōb* (Meg. Taʿan. ix.), this event and the embitterment which it left awakened in the sect the same theological conception long since evolved through similar political fortune in the kindred religion.

(*f*) Relevant to the significance which Grätz believes was given to the Hanukkah-lamp, namely, that this was a symbol of the Law, is the appearance in Samaritan theology, already in the teaching of Marka, of the doctrine that the Law is of the essence of God Himself, *i.e.* fire. According to Marka (Heidenheim, *ibid.* iii. 68 b; Montgomery, *ibid.*, pp. 222, 232 f.), "the Law came forth from the fire" and the two tables of the Law "were separated from the lamp of His knowledge." But although in general the Law is regarded as detached from the fire of deity, "a spark from God's vesture" (Gesenius, *Carmina Samaritana*, iii. 4), there is no approach to the personification of the Law as is found in the second pre-Christian century in Judaism, where the Law is identified with that product of mysticism, Wisdom (cf. Chapter VI. above). The mystic conception of the Law as divine fire, in the Samaritan theology of the fourth century, may be only a reflex of the very pronounced notions of a like kind entertained by the Rabbis of the first centuries of our era (cf. Abelson, *Jewish Mysticism*, p. 40 f.). But the fact that the Samaritans had the custom of using fire as a medium of ritual purification, and in the practice of ritual purification (baptisms), as Montgomery thinks (*ut sup.*, p. 43), rather influenced Judaism than received from it, prevents us from assuming that a borrowing from Judaism of the ideas under consideration in respect of the Law must needs be supposed. It may seem probable that the Samaritans' ritual use of fire and their ideas, as applied to the Law, of the divine nature of fire are independent of Judaism and derive directly from Iranian belief and practice. The description, in the Book of Acts, of the descent of the Holy Spirit as tongues of fire upon the disciples on the day of Pentecost, a day associated in Jewish tradition with the giving of the Law, points to a time much anterior to the date of Acts for the currency of the imagery and mystic thought here employed, and to these having had expression in such ritual[1] as is attested among the Samaritans.

---

[1] Cf. P. Saintyves, *Essais de Folklore Biblique*, p. 39 : "Le récit des Actes qui commémoire la fête (de la Pentecôte) se rattache evidemment à un ancien rite de purification et d'initiation par le feu, considéré comme agent de la divinité."

APPENDIX IV

The Reference to the Festival in St. John's Gospel

In consequence of our conclusions regarding the character of Hanukkah as the festival of the New Age, it may seem that in the utterances of Christ (St. John x. 22 f.) during the "enkainia" we are justified in seeing an allusion to the nature of the festival. In the scheme of the Fourth Gospel the festivals play a prominent part (Passover, ii. 13; a feast of the Jews, v. 1; Passover, vi. 4; Booths, vii. 2; Hanukkah, x. 22; Passover, xii. 1–19). These do not all appear to serve merely a chronological purpose.

It cannot be considered rash or illegitimate to perceive in a writing so full of symbol and allegorical traits a connexion in idea between the allusion to the Passover in vi. 4 as being nigh and the feeding of the five thousand (vi. 5 f.). This incident prefaces the teaching concerning the Bread of Life. But the Christian Passover, the Lord's Supper, we may suppose, is here brought to the remembrance of the reader, just as, in the third chapter, in the dialogue with Nicodemus on the birth from above, there is reference to the other sacrament, Baptism.

Zahn (*Kommentar*, 1908, p. 389 f.), L. Albrecht (*Das Neue Test.*, 4th ed. 1924, p. 293 f.; cf. Strack-Billerbeck, *Das Evang. aus Talmud u. Midrash*, 1924, Bd. ii. p. 490 f.), and other exegetes believe that the words spoken on the occasion of the festival of Booths (vii. 2, 37 f.), when Jesus proclaims Himself to be the Satisfier of the thirst of man and as the Light of the world (viii. 12), have in view the great events of this festival: the bringing of water in a golden vessel by the high-priest daily from the well of Siloam, the pouring out of the water as *libation* on the western side of the altar of burnt-offering, the illuminating of the Temple mount. H. J. Holtzmann indeed (*Hand-Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*, Bd. iv., " Evang., Briefe, und Offenbarung des Johannes," 1908, p. 165) holds this opinion to be an archæological fancy (*archäologische Grille*), but his reason for rejecting it, namely, that Jesus is speaking of persons who have the desire of drinking, and not concerning libations, would impose a very rigid limitation upon the thought and spirit of the writer who, more than any other New Testament author, exploits situations and actions in pursuance of his theme. Rabbinic evidence amply demonstrates (see Strack-Billerbeck, *l.c.*, p. 804 f.) that the words of the prophecy (Isa. xii. 3), " Therefore with joy shall ye draw water out of the wells of Salvation," were regarded in a manner as the Scripture text for Booths, and as warrant of the rejoicings in the " House of the Water-drawing." The libation-ritus naturally created for itself a wider context of religious thought. The author of the Fourth Gospel may well actually have had in mind this same prophetic utterance as fulfilled in the Christ who stood and cried on the great day of the feast, " If any man thirst, let him come unto Me and drink." But the fact that in the description of the last journey of Jesus to Jerusalem (xii. 13) the people who herald the Messiah's entry are not represented, as by the Synoptists (Mark xi. 8; Matt. xxi. 8), strewing their garments (Luke xix. 36) and branches in the way, but as bearing palms (τὰ βαία τῶν φοινίκων, symbol of victory; cf. Rev. vii. 9), shows that the evangelist is careful to make symbol the vehicle of this thought, and loses no opportunity of doing so, though he may let symbol speak, as it ought, for itself. It is possible that the Johannine picture of Jesus' entrance to the Holy City reproduces what previously had become a tradition of the Early Church; but even thus, the preference for this tradition as over against the Synoptic account is not less significant. By the Synoptists' narrative of the preparation Jesus makes for His entering, we are reminded that, apart from the great instance of the Lord's Supper, they depict Jesus Himself as, after ancient prophetic pattern, reinforcing His teaching, particularly His claims, by symbolic action; and if in the Johannine Gospel this feature is more constantly present (*e.g.* changing water into wine; raising of Lazarus), and developed so that certain festival occasions provide the fitting situation for certain didactic passages, the author is employing a method which was original to Jesus.

According to the Johannine account of the Last Supper (xiii. 1 f.), this is described as being partaken of before the festival of Passover. When Judas left the supper table (xiii. 29), some of the disciples supposed that he was going out to make the necessary purchases for the festival. After the supper, Jesus goes beyond the city, is arrested, and brought finally to the Prætorium (xviii. 28), into which place the Jews refrain from going lest they might render themselves unclean, and thus be unable to eat the Paschal victim (φάγωσι τὸ πάσχα). The Last Supper, it is clear, was according to the Fourth Gospel (xix. 14) eaten on the "Preparation of the Passover," *i.e.* the 14th Nisan (see Strack-Billerbeck, *l.c.*, p. 834 f., "Exkurs: Der Todestag Jesu"), which began, in Jewish reckoning, at sunset, and on which day about noon Jesus was led from Pilate's tribunal to the cross. The next day began with the evening of 15th Nisan, when the Passover was eaten. The Crucifixion therefore took place from midday onwards, " between the two evenings " (Ex. xii. 6) of 14th and 15th Nisan, that is, during the hours of 14th Nisan when it was the custom to present and slaughter the Paschal victims at the temple; and the Resurrection occurred on the day on which the sheaf of first-fruits was presented at the same place. The Evangelist (xix. 36) plainly represents Christ as the Paschal victim whereof no bone shall be broken (Ex. xii. 46). His date for the death of Jesus and his symbolism are in agreement; for, as Strack-Billerbeck observes (*l.c.*, p. 840), no Jew or Jewish Christian could regard Jesus as veritable Paschal-lamb unless he had died on 14th Nisan. From a special study of the Passover, Dr. Buchanan Gray (*Sacrifice in the O.T.*, p. 388) also concludes that in the Fourth Gosepl " there certainly seems to have been present to the mind of the author the thought that Jesus, dying at the hour of the slaughter of the Paschal victim, was himself a Paschal victim, the true Passover." Thus this Gospel, which does not, as do the Synoptists, record the *actions* of Christ at the Last Supper in respect of the bread and cup, distinctively marks out a particular Paschal rite in order to convey its doctrine of the significance of Christ's death.

Now if it be accepted that in the Fourth Gospel Booths and Passover offer to the teaching concerning the work of Christ significant rites as a mirror of Christian doctrine, this inference induces to an examination of the words of Jesus spoken on the occasion of Hanukkah. Is it permissible to detect in the reference to " the enkainia " (x. 22) an idea of greater import than that it was now winter, and that Jesus was constrained to be indoors in the porch of Solomon? The section (x. 22–39), in respect of the time concerned and the topic discussed, is a literary unit which might be given the title, "Jesus is interpellated regarding the Messiahship" (cf. H. Appel, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, Leipzig, 1922, p. 215: "Am Tempelweihfest wird Jesus über seine Messianität interpelliert"). Throughout the Gospel the Person of Jesus as promised Messiah, His divine dignity, is the central concept. In the opening chapter the Baptist testifies to Jesus as Messiah, and Jesus is confessed as such in the inner circle of the disciples (i. 40 f.). But on the occasion of Hanukkah, the subject of Jesus' Messiahship as affecting the nation is at last brought to explicit formulation in question and answer. The question on the part of the Jews is: "How long do you mean to keep us in suspense? If you are the Christ, tell us so plainly." The answer which Jesus returns is that His works (*τὰ ἔργα ἃ ἐγὼ ποιῶ*) are His credentials, the testimony that the sovereignty of God's Messiah is already present, and that (ver. 28) life in the new aion, "eternal life" [*ζωὴν αἰώνιον*, "a conception comprehensive of all Messianic blessings" (Holtzmann, *ut sup.*, p. 35; cf. p. 82), and Johannine equivalent of the Synoptic "Kingdom of God" (cf. iii. 3, 36; though cf. also Mark x. 17 = Luke xviii. 18; Matt. xix. 16; Mark ix. 43, 45, 47 = Matt. xviii. 8, 9)] is already being participated in by His followers.

In St. John x. 22 f. the question which the Jews ask and the response they obtain correspond to the subject-matter of the Synoptic narrative (Matt. xi. 2 f.; Luke vii. 22*b* f.), where Jesus replies to the message of the Baptist. The Baptist asks Jesus: "Are you the Coming One?" (*ὁ ἐρχόμενος*, a technical term = the *κύριος* of the Parousia), and Jesus says: "Go and report to John what you see and hear:

"Blind receive their sight and the lame walk;
Lepers are cleansed and the deaf hear;
And the dead are raised up, and the poor have the Good News
proclaimed to them."

Such descriptions of the Messianic age, as the O.T. passages Isa. xxix. 18 f., xxxv. 5 f., lxi. 1 show, are of older currency, and connect with the poetry concerning the "Golden Age" and with the literary style (*Hofstil*) of those effusions which sing the blessings of the reigns of living monarchs (cf. Gressmann, *Ursprung der israelit.-jüd. Eschatologie*, p. 259; Martin Dibelius, *Die urchristliche Überlieferung von Johannes dem Täufer*, p. 35). The style of Jesus' answer is poetic, but whether we regard the words as receiving this form from Jesus Himself, or, as Dibelius suggests, as being part of an early Christian hymn (cf. Luke i. 46 f., 68 f.) in praise of the Messianic Age, it is the traditional note which Jesus' response strikes that invests this with sufficiency and meaning as a reply to the inquiring Baptist. Jesus indicates to the Baptist, as in St. John x. 22 f. to the representatives of the nation, that the signs of the Messianic Age are being fulfilled, the works which were popularly anticipated are being accomplished, that the Kingdom of God has come. That this theme, the divine sovereignty in the New Age, should be selected by the author of the Fourth Gospel as the topic for the days of the enkainia may not appear to be accidental if it be recognized that in other instances his mention of a festival serves a wider purpose than merely that of connecting the ministry of Jesus with Jerusalem.

INDEX

Abelson, 272.
Achæmenid, 208.
Ahriman, 179, 208.
Ahura-Mazda, 70, 158, 179, 186, 208.
Aion (Age), 207–216, 220, 223, 227–229 f., 233–237 f., 240–242 f., 251 f., 253 f., 255 f., 277 f.
Alcimus, 219 f.
Alexander (the Great), 22, 23.
Alexandria, 209, 241.
Altar(s), 92, 127, 137 f., 141 f., 148, 155, 250 f., 255, 270.
Ancient of Days, 238 f., 247 f., 250.
Antiochus (of Commagene), 143.
Antiochus IV. See Epiphanes.
Antonia, 98, 161.
Apellæus (16th A. = 8th November), 201, 202 (25th A.).
Apollo, 110, 140 f. (Agyieus), 145 f., 157, 211, 220, 234 f., 237 f., 240, 242 f., 255.
Apotropaic, 139, 156, 172.
Appel, 277.
Aristeas, 172.
Armaiti, 179 f.
Artemis, 69.
Ascension (of Christ), 229 f.
Asia Minor, 124 f., 166, 234, 243.
Assurbanipal, 240.
Athanasius, 43.
Atonement, 32, 47, 72, 92, 118, 167, 206, 260.
Augur, 30, 246.
Augustine, 181, 263.
Augustus, 194, 242 f.
Aurelian, 201.
Ausonius, 205.

Baba Mezia, 198 f., 200, 202.
Baba Qamma, 4, 80, 134.
Babylonian, 67 f., 78, 146, 184, 207, 210, 237, 239 f., 244, 248 f., 254.
Bacchæ. See Dionysus.
Baptist, 277 f.
Baumgarten, 237, 240.
Beer, 74 f., 230, 248, 266.
Beirut, 215.
Bel-semin, 106, 204, 205, 208, 213 f., 215, 235.
Benaiah, 197.
Bertholet, 149, 160, 185, 212.
Bevan, 215, 217.
Birthday (of Christ), 192 f., 202.
Birthday (king's), 21, 104 f., 148, 220, 250.
Boll, 199 f., 205 f., 214.
Booths, 53, 67, 74, 80 f., 88, 91 f., 95, 115, 116, 118 f., 167, 196, 203, 226, 259, 273 f.
Bosphoran (kingdom), 124.
Bouché-Leclercq, 165.
Bousset, 16, 163, 172, 175 f., 178 f., 181, 185, 187, 208, 211, 213, 218, 236, 240, 244, 246, 251, 256.
Branches, 91, 94 f., 105 f., 112, 119, 203.
Briggs, 94, 160, 183, 218, 221.

Calendar, 120 f., 192, 194 f.
Canopus (decree), 192 f.
Caves, 110 f.
Chaldean, 68, 73, 177, 208, 209, 214, 237 f., 240, 242, 245 f., 248.
Charles, 17, 139, 182, 185, 218, 230, 240, 244 f., 256.
Cheyne, 183.
Christmas, 119, 122, 193 f., 201, 202.
Chronology, 7 f.
Church-wakes, 202.
Claudianus, 237 f., 247, 261 f.
Cleansing, 92, 108, 115, 139, 272.
Clermont-Ganneau, 145.
Coins, 144, 215, 235, 253.
Colonies (Jewish), 124 f.
Consecration, Chapter II. (also Dedication).
Constantine, 253 f.
Constantinople, 216.
Covenant (testament), 38 f., 167, 169, 170, 174, 183, 255.
Cult-signs, 172 f.

Cumont, 121, 124 f., 128, 205, 206, 214.
Cybele, 110.

Daēna, 180 f., 186, 188, 255.
Dalman, 98, 124, 159 f., 161, 167, 196, 218, 223.
Damascus-text, 5, 170, 211.
Daniel, 104, 175 f., 198, 211, 213 f., 216, 221, 225, 230, 237, 239, 247, 254.
Dasius, 205 f.
David, 219 f., 256.
Dead, 148 f.
December, 105 f., 119, 121, 123, 133, 191 f., 199, 210.
Dedicare, 28 f., and Chapter II.
Deissmann, 96, 116, 173.
Delos, 144.
Delphi, 144, 234 f.
Derenbourg, 82, 111, 124, 161, 165, 202, 218.
Deuteronomy, 102, 118, 137, 183.
Diaspora, 124.
Dibelius, 278.
Dillmann, 28, 191.
Dionysus, 21, 46, 104 f., 109 f., 116 f., 121, 123, 127, 142, 145, 147, 151, 204, 234 f.
Divine-king, 240 f., 242 f.
Domaszewski, 201.
Door, 85 f., 100, 118, 127, 133 f., 171, 265.
Driver, 72, 145, 150.
Dualism, 174, 179 f.
Durostorum, 200, 206.
Dusares, 106, 113, 121, 145.

Eadie, 202.
Edersheim, 101.
Egypt, 209 f., 213, 233, 240 f., 252, 255, 263.
Eight (days), 92, 121.
Eisele, 126.
Empyromantic, 165 f.
Enkainia, 200, 276 f.
Enkainismos, Chapter II., 114.
Enmeduranki, 244 f., 249.
Enoch (Books), 176, 178, 211 f., 218, 230, 244 f., 254.
Enoch (person), 244–250.
Epiphanes, 10 f., 12, 21, 49, 108, 127, 137, 160, 169 f., 214, 215, 242, 268.
Epiphanius, 191 f., 201, 209.
Epitomist, 13 f., 18, 41, 45, 50, 71, 76, 101, 107 f., 112, 118, 168.
Equinox (autumn), 100, 122, 196 f., 203.
Era, 7 f.
Eschatology, 17, 73, 175 f., 177, 211, 217, 255 f., 269 f.
Eudemus, 208.
Euktemon, 199.
Euripides, 109, 112, 144.
Eusebius, 43.
Ewald, 54, 64, 99, 117.
Ezekiel, 72.

Farnell, 140, 234.
Fascher, 29, 162, 163 f.
Festivals, 102, 104, 115, 118, 129, 137, 155 f., 167, 169, 174, 216, 260, 273 f.
Fihrist, 181.
Fire (sacred), 63 f., 67 f., 73, 84, 87, 99, 101, 103, 108, 143 f., 145 f., 176 f., 235, 271 f.
Frazer, 145.
Furtwängler, 144.

Geiger, 144, 158.
Gerizim, 266 f., 268 f., 271.
Girru-Nusku, 70.
Gnosis, 182, 186 f., 188.
God of Fortresses, 215.
Grätz, 54, 155–188, 202, 271.
Gray, 96, 97, 122, 203, 264 f.
Gregory Nazianzus, 192, 195.
Gressmann, 95, 100, 128, 134, 143, 144, 149, 179, 181, 184, 186, 191, 210 f., 214, 237 f., 247, 278.
Gunkel, 176, 177, 184, 248, 251.

Hagia Sophia, 253, 254.
Hallel, 93.
Hamburger, 92, 156.
Hanok. See Enoch.
Hanukkah (name), 114, 243–250.
Harnack, 44, 243.
Harris (R.), 145, 235.
Hasidim, 76, 170, 173, 218 f., 223, 227.
Hasmoneans, 81 f., 87, 92, 123, 160, 218 f., 220 f., 222, 227, 251, 255.
Hebrews (Epistle), 38 f.
Hefele, 29.
Hekatæos, 24.
Helios, 125, 141, 144, 145, 192, 206 f., 214, 233 f., 237, 239 f., 242, 250, 264.
Hellenism, 21 f., 136 f., 157 f., 163, 166, 169, 209, 214, 236, 246.
Hellenistic, 214, 239, 251, 266 f.

Hephaistos, 64.
Herdsmen, 111.
Herod, 81 f., 198.
Herodotus, 69, 134.
Hesiod, 209.
Hillel, 80, 86.
Hills, 109 f.
Hippolytus, 138, 141 f.
Hispalus, 126.
Hochfeld, 52, 60 f., 80, 86 f., 91, 98, 114, 156, 224.
Holl, 192, 195, 201.
Hölscher, 97, 225, 267 f.
Holtzmann, 274 f.
Holy Sepulchre Church, 65.
Horn (of an ox), 111, 151.
Horus, 210.
Houting, 28, 78.
Huart (C.), 68.
Hypsistos, 124 f. (Hypsistarii, 125), 204, 214, 250.
Hyrkanus, 166, 173, 200, 218.

Ideler, 197, 202.
Incense, 166.
Initiate, 30 f.
Intercalation, 194.
Iranian, 68, 70 f., 143 f., 158, 174, 177 f., 179, 181 f., 185 f., 208, 211, 214, 230, 237 f., 242, 248, 250, 254 f.
Isis, 210.
Ivy, 105, 113, 142, 235.

Jamnia, 21.
Jannæus, 97.
Janus, 211, 242, 244, 250.
Jason (of Cyrene), 14 f., 18 f., 41, 71, 103, 107 f., 142, 168.
Jason (high-priest), 21, 136 f., 168, 170, 185, 227.
Jastrow, 184, 207.
Jeremiah, 270.
Jeremias, 215, 221, 244, 248.
Jesus, 273 f.
John of Gaza, 213.
Jonathan, 217, 219.
Josephus, 4, 13, 76 f., 80, 97, 112, 119, 138, 149, 166, 173, 200, 202, 206, 217, 218, 223, 251, 268, 270.
Jubilees, 85, 95, 167, 169, 211, 218, 245 f.
Judaism, 123, 124, 128, 139, 141, 143, 146, 148 f., 155 f., 165, 166, 173, 174, 176 f. 179, 211 f., 216, 236, 245 f., 251 f., 254, 269 f.
Judas, 123, 158, 168, 173, 217 f., 224.
Julius Paris, 126.
Jupiter Sabazius, 125.
Juvenal, 84.

Kamphausen, 10, 15, 17, 102, 107, 138.
Kathartic, 139.
Kautzsch, 147, 240.
Keil, 124.
Kennedy (A. R. S.), 172 f., 215.
Kern, 109 f., 141 f., 235.
Kevan, 215.
Kikellia, 191 f.
Kislev, 88, 96, 103, 105 f., 109, 115, 119 f., 121 f., 133, 147, 148, 191 f., 196 f., 202 f., 205, 213, 216, 260, 265, 266, 269, 271.
Kittel, 120, 191 f., 244–250.
Kohut, 75.
Kolbe, 7 f., 13 f., 17, 19, 106, 108.
Kore, 209.
Kos, 95.
Kosters, 17.
Krauss, 54, 79 f., 81, 88, 98, 114, 156, 198, 226.
Kronia, 191 f., 213.
Kronos, 200 f., 205 f., 208 f., 213, 215, 230, 233 f., 237, 242, 247, 264.
Kubitschek, 202.

Lackeit, 252, 254.
Lamp, 149 f., 151, 156, 171, 220 f., 223, 227, 228, 250 f., 255.
Lamp-stand, 59, 60, Chapter III., 134 f., 148, 222.
Laqueur, 11, 13, 18.
Law, 51 f., 103, 156–188, 220, 225, 252 f., 255, 271 f.
Levi (Israel), 88.
Libanomantic, 166.
Liber (M.), 91, 93, 99.
Licinius (edict of), 201 f., 205, 236.
Lidzbarski, 213.
Lietzmann, 240 f.
Life, 177, 181, 183.
Light(s), 133 f., 171, 176, 177, 183, 188, 192, 224, 250 f., 255.
Lightfoot, 197, 199.
Lord's Supper, 273 f.
Lulab, 100.
Lund, 202.
Lunisolar, 120 f., 196 f., 202.
Lydus, 142, 199, 211.

Maccabees (criticism of 1 M. and 2 M.), 5–24.

Maccabees, 123, 218, 220 f., 256, 268.
Macrobius, 192, 207, 210, 236.
Magi, 75, 208.
Maimonides, 4, 67, 86, 135, 138, 259.
Makkabi, 217, 220.
Malkuth Jahveh, 220 f., 223, 227.
Mandæism, 182.
Mani, 181.
Manichæism, 181, 186.
Marka, 267 f.
Mattathias, 169 f.
Mazdaism, 175, 214.
Megillath Taʻanith (description of, 3), 79, 114, 135, 145, 159, 196.
Menelaos, 136 f., 185, 227.
Messala, 210.
Messianic, 212 f., 216 f., 218 f., 220 f., 224 f., 227, 230, 233 f., 239, 241, 247, 255 f., 267 f., 269, 274 f.
Metatron, 246 f.
Meyer (Ed.), 7 f., 11, 14, 18, 73, 104, 113, 119, 127, 136, 169 f., 175, 177 f., 185, 191, 198, 203, 208, 219, 241, 268.
Mezuzah, 135, 171 f., 265.
Midrash Ber. Rab., 203.
Milligan, 42.
Mishnah references, 259 f.
Mithras, 144, 207.
Mœsia, 201.
Moffatt, 11, 14, 107, 138.
Montgomery, 265 f.
Months (names), 115, 117, 123, 197, 199, 250, 260.
Moulton, 71.
Mountains, 109 f., 116 f.
Musaph, 98.
Mysian (Stele), 125, 128.
Mystai, 192.
Mystic thought, 178–188, 253.
Myth, 133, 143, 146, 230, 237, 240, 249.

Nabatæans, 145.
Nabu, 248.
Naphtha (oil), 50, 68 f., 77, 92.
Narayan Deo, 145.
Nazirite, 37.
Nehemiah, 50 f., 61, 107, 112, 146, 217.
Neith, 134.
Nepotianus, 126.
New Testament, 38 f., 273 f.
New Year, 200, 203, 205, 234, 244, 250.
Niese, 6 f., 16 f., 108.
Nilsson, 120, 122, 147, 194 f.
Ninib, 215.
Norden, 119, 191 f., 199, 204, 209 f., 239 f., 241.
November, 199 f., 201 f., 203, 205 f., 207, 234.
Nowack, 150.

Oehler, 167.
Oesterley, 6, 86, 88.
Oil. See Naphtha.
Olmstead, 220.
Onias, 21 f., 104, 168.
Oracle, 157 f.
Osiris, 194, 210.

Parsism (=Mazdaism; see above), 73, 75.
Passover, 87, 93, 98, 102, 114, 196, 260, 265 f., 273 f.
Pentecost, 98, 102 f., 167, 196, 203, 226, 259, 272.
Persius, 81 f.
Pesikta Rabbati, 3, 79.
Pessinus, 110.
Petersen, 141.
Petra, 106, 121.
Pharisees, 23, 76, 87, 114, 170, 173, 220, 251, 268.
Philo, 173.
Philo (Byb.), 215.
Phœnician, 145 f., 206, 213, 215 f.
Phylacteries. See Tephillin.
Placing (precept of) the Lamp, 136.
Pleiades, 200.
Plutarch, 179.
Pohlenz, 213.
Polybius, 8, 13.
Priesthood, 218 f.
Priestly Code, 107, 122, 183, 251.
Prophets, 160, 162, 164, 166, 265.
Proverbs (Book of), 179 f.
Psalms, 146, 159 (iii.); 160, 163 (lxxiv.); 183 (cxix.); 184 (xix.); 221 (cxxxii.); 226 (xxx.); 228 f. (xlvii.).
Psalms, Maccabean, 160.
Purim, 94, 114, 259, 260.

Rabban S. ben Gamaliel, 99.
Rab Kahana, 45, 228.
Ramsay, 30, 133.
Redemption, 32 f.
Reisch, 141.
Reitzenstein, 126 f., 139, 141 f., 175 f., 180, 182, 185 f., 187, 208, 212, 215, 233, 242, 253, 254

Religious reason (*hieros logos*), 134 f., 145, 251.
Resheph, 145.
Resurrection, 175 f., 211, 266 f., 276.
Retribution, 12 f., 163, 176.
Rhode, 111, 123, 234, 249.
Riehm, 31, 191.
Ritual, 133, 145, 148, 151, 155, 168, 171, 174, 192, 203, 209, 240, 255, 272.
Rome, 126, 201, 209, 210, 216, 219, 225, 242 f., 253.
Roscher, 173, 195.

Sabaoth, 125 f.
Sabazius, 110, 111, 123 f., 126, 128, 142.
Sabbath, 166, 169, 245.
Sabbath-lamps, 74 f., 82, 84, 118.
Sacrifice, 92, 96 f., 137 f., 149.
Sadducees, 267 f.
Saintyves, 63 f., 70, 198, 272.
Salsovia, 201, 205.
Samaritans, 150, 264 f.
Sassanids, 75, 78.
Saturnalia, 191 f., 195, 206.
Saviour, 236, 240 f., 242.
Schlatter, 19.
Schroeder, 140, 144.
Schürer, 10 f., 23 f., 84, 104, 124, 126, 185, 196, 205, 217, 225.
Schwally, 148, 150, 246.
Sculpture, 113.
Sellar, 85.
Sĕmavatha, 159 f.
Septuagint, 196.
Servius, 207, 243.
Shamash, 184.
Shammai, 80, 86.
Shekinah, 228 f.
Sibylline Oracles, 5, 164, 165.
Signs, 159 f.
Simon, 124, 127 f., 128, 162, 173, 218, 220.
Sirach, 23, 146, 150, 162, 164 f., 178, 182 f., 185, 212, 217, 230, 253 f., 255.
Smith (Robertson), 93, 164.
Söderblom, 175.
Solar, 100, 120 f., 200 f., 205, 236 f., 238 f., 240, 244 f., 246 f., 249, 261 f.
Sophocles, 157.
Sovereignty, 213, 220 f., 222 f., 225, 227, 238, 253 f., 255 f., 277 f.
Spears, 79, 81.
Stade, 66, 72, 138, 149 f., 171 f.
Staerk, 184.
Stengel, 157.
Stephanus, 29.
Stilicho, 237 f., 240, 261 f.
St. John's Gospel (x. 22), 27, 273 f.
St. John, 199 f.
Stones of defilement, 161.
St. Paul, 187, 188, 252 f.
Strabo, 69, 145.
Strack, 112, 148, 199, 273 f.
Sukkah (Mishnah), 99.
Synagogue (Scripture) lessons, 4, 167, 222 f., 225 f., 260.
Syncretism, 129, 186.
Syria, 200 f., 203, 206 f., 210, 213, 216, 234, 236 f.

Tabernacles. See Booths.
Tacitus, 85.
Talmud (Sab. 21, b), 77 f., 86.
Targum, 197.
Taylor, 148.
Tebeth, 147, 196 f.
Ten, 115.
Tephillin, 171 f., 265.
Teraphim, 149, 171.
Tertullian, 150.
Testament XII. Patr., 5, 178, 211.
Thackeray, St. J., 4, 99, 146, 226.
Threshold (sacrifice, mark), 32, 145, 149, 172.
Thyrsus, 107 f., 112 f.
Tishri, 167, 197, 199, 203, 260.
Tobit, 139, 217.
Torches, 117 f.
Translation-myth, 245 f., 249.
Trumpets, 67.
Tyrrell, 109 f.

Usener, 193.

Valerius Maximus, 126, 142.
Venetianer, 202, 228 f.
Vergil, 211, 233, 236, 239, 240, 242.
Vestments, 98.
Vitellius, 98.

Waehner, 54, 119.
Weber, 200 f., 205 f., 233.
Weeks. See Pentecost.
Weizäcker, 27.
Wellhausen, 8 f., 20, 54, 104, 106, 109, 114 f., 119, 123, 148, 158, 191, 203 f., 217.
Wernicke, 140, 144, 147, 157, 166, 234 f.

Wild beasts, 107 f.
Windows, 81 f.
Winter, 123, 196 f., 199 f., 213, 234, 276.
Winter-solstice, 99, 117, 118 f., 121 f., 133, 191 f., 197, 199.
Wisdom, 178–188, 229 f., 252 f., 255.
Women, 88, 109, 117.
World-ages, 208, 211, 214, 218, 228 f., 233 f., 238, 243, 251 f., 254.
World-judgment, 175 f., 177, 211.

Yasht (xxii.), 181 f., 186.

Zarvan, 208 f., 214 f., 230, 239, 247.
Zerubbabel, 222, 227.
Zeus, 46, 106, 125, 137, 204 f., 213, 215, 268.
Zoroastrianism, 71, 73, 179. See Parsism.

PRINTED BY MORRISON AND GIBB LTD., EDINBURGH AND LONDON

Date Due

Fac
FE 24 '00

PRINTED IN U. S. A.

T. Wever
Antiquariaat

296.435
R211

Rankin, Oliver Shaw
AUTHOR

The origins of the festival of
TITLE Hanukkah.

34636

296.435
R211 Rankin, Oliver Shaw
The origins of the festival
of Hanukkah.

34636